arXiv:1401.0050v5 [cs.IT] 2 Apr 2014

# Bounds on the rate of superimposed codes [0]

**A. G. D'yachkov, I.V. Vorobyev, N.A. Polyanskii, V.Yu. Shchukin**

Moscow State University, Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics,
Department of Probability Theory, Moscow, 119992, Russia,
agd-msu@yandex.ru, vorobyev.i.v@yandex.ru, nikitapolyansky@gmail.com, vpike@mail.ru

**Abstract.** A binary code is called a superimposed cover-free $(s,\ell)$-code if the code is identified by the incidence matrix of a family of finite sets in which no intersection of $\ell$ sets is covered by the union of $s$ others. A binary code is called a superimposed list-decoding $s_L$-code if the code is identified by the incidence matrix of a family of finite sets in which the union of any $s$ sets can cover not more than $L-1$ other sets of the family. For $L=\ell=1$, both of the definitions coincide and the corresponding binary code is called a superimposed $s$-code. Our aim is to obtain new lower and upper bounds on the rate of the given codes. The most interesting result is a lower bound on the rate of superimposed cover-free $(s,\ell)$-codes based on the ensemble of constant weight binary codes. If the parameter $\ell \geq 1$ is fixed and $s \to \infty$, then the ratio of this lower bound to the best known upper bound converges to the limit $2\,e^{-2} = 0,271$. For the classical case $\ell = 1$, the given statement means that the upper bound on the rate of superimposed $s$-codes obtained by A.G. Dyachkov and V.V. Rykov (1982) is asymptotically attained to within a constant factor $a$, $2\,e^{-2} \leq a \leq 1$.

*Index terms.* Superimposed codes, rate of codes, bounds on the rate, group testing, screening experiments, search designs.

## 1 Notations, Definitions and Results

Let $N$, $t$, $s$, $L$ and $\ell$ be integers, where $1 \leq s < t$, $1 \leq L \leq t-s$, $1 \leq \ell \leq t-s$. Let $\triangleq$ denote the equality by definition, $|A|$ – the size of $A$ and $[N] \triangleq \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$ - the set of integers from 1 to $N$. A binary $(N \times t)$-matrix

$$X = \|x_i(j)\|, \quad x_i(j) = 0,1, \quad \boldsymbol{x}_i \triangleq (x_i(1),\ldots,x_i(t)), \quad \boldsymbol{x}(j) \triangleq (x_1(j),\ldots,x_N(j)), \qquad (1)$$

$i \in [N]$, $j \in [t]$, with $N$ rows $\boldsymbol{x}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{x}_N$ and $t$ columns $\boldsymbol{x}(1),\ldots,\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ (codewords) is called a *binary code of length $N$ and size $t$*. The number of 1's in column $x(j)$, i.e., $|\boldsymbol{x}(j)| \triangleq \sum\limits_{i=1}^{N} x_i(j)$, is called the *weight* of $x(j)$, $j \in [t]$. A code $X$ is called a *constant weight* binary code of weight $w$, $1 < w < N$, if for any $j \in [t]$, the weight $|\boldsymbol{x}(j)| = w$. The standard symbol $\bigvee$ denotes the *disjunct* (Boolean) sum of two binary numbers:

$$0 \bigvee 0 = 0, \quad 0 \bigvee 1 = 1 \bigvee 0 = 1 \bigvee 1 = 1,$$

as well as the component-wise disjunct sum of two binary columns. We say that a column $\mathbf{u}$ covers column $\mathbf{v}$ ($\mathbf{u} \succeq \mathbf{v}$) if $\mathbf{u} \bigvee \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}$. The standard symbol $\lfloor a \rfloor$ ($\lceil a \rceil$) will be used to denote the largest (least) integer $\leq a$ ($\geq a$).

[0] The given article is a preprint of the paper which is published in *Problems of Information Transmission*, 2014, Vol. 50, No. 1., pp. 27-56

**Definition 1.** [1]. A code $X$ is called a *superimposed cover-free* $(s,\ell)$*-code* (briefly, *CF* $(s,\ell)$*-code*) if for any two non-intersecting sets $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{L} \subset [t]$, $|\mathcal{S}| = s$, $|\mathcal{L}| = \ell$, $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{L} = \varnothing$, there exists a row $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $i \in [N]$, for which

$$x_i(j) = 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad j \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \text{and} \quad x_i(k) = 1 \quad \text{for any} \quad k \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Taking into account the evident symmetry over $s$ and $\ell$, we introduce $t_{cf}(N,s,\ell) = t_{cf}(N,\ell,s)$ - the maximal size of CF $(s,\ell)$-codes of length $N$ and $N_{cf}(t,s,\ell) = N_{cf}(t,\ell,s)$ - the minimal length of CF $(s,\ell)$-codes of size $t$. We also define the *rate* of CF $(s,\ell)$-codes:

$$R(s,\ell) = R(\ell,s) \triangleq \varlimsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{\log_2 t_{cf}(N,s,\ell)}{N} = \varlimsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\log_2 t}{N_{cf}(t,s,\ell)}. \tag{2}$$

**Definition 2.** [2]. A code $X$ is called a *list-decoding superimposed code* of *strength* $s$ *and list size* $L$ (briefly, *LD* $s_L$*-code*), if the disjunct sum of any $s$-subset of codewords $X$ can cover not more than $L-1$ codewords that are not components of the given $s$-subset. Introduce $t_{ld}(N,s,L)$ – the maximal size of LD $s_L$-codes of length $N$ and $N_{ld}(t,s,L)$ – the minimal length of LD $s_L$-codes of size $t$. We also define the *rate* of LD $s_L$-codes:

$$R_L(s) \triangleq \varlimsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{\log_2 t_{ld}(N,s,L)}{N} = \varlimsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\log_2 t}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)}. \tag{3}$$

If $L = \ell = 1$, then Definitions 1 and 2 coincide, i.e., $R_1(s) = R(s,1)$, $s = 1,2,\ldots,$ and the corresponding code is called a *superimposed* $s$*-code*. Superimposed $s$-codes were introduced in the initial paper [3], where the first nontrivial properties, applications and constructions[1] were developed. In addition, the problem of obtaining bounds on the rate $R(s,1)$ was suggested.

### 1.1 Lower and Upper Bounds on $R(s,1)$

The best known lower bound on the rate $R(s,1)$ was obtained in paper [6], where using a random coding method based on the ensemble of binary constant weight codes[2], we proved that

$$R(s,1) \geq \underline{R}(s,1) \triangleq s^{-1} \cdot \max_{0<Q<1} A(s,Q), \qquad s = 1,2,\ldots, \tag{4}$$

$$A(s,Q) \triangleq \log_2 \frac{Q}{1-y} - sK(Q,1-y) - K\left(Q, \frac{1-y}{1-y^s}\right), \tag{5}$$

$$K(a,b) \triangleq a \cdot \log_2 \frac{a}{b} + (1-a) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1-a}{1-b}, \quad 0 < a,b < 1, \tag{6}$$

and $y = y(s,Q)$, $1 - Q \leq y < 1$, is the unique root of the equation:

$$y = 1 - Q + Q\,y^s \cdot \frac{1-y}{1-y^s}, \qquad 1 - Q \leq y < 1. \tag{7}$$

[1] Later on, the constructions were essentially extended in [4]-[5]

[2] The ensemble of constant weight codes is the particular case of a code ensemble called the fixed-composition ensemble (FCE) which was suggested in [7] to construct the best upper bounds on error probability for discrete memoryless channels. In [8], the FCE was applied to a similar problem for multiple access channels. In [9]-[11], we studied the logarithmic asymptotics of average error probability for FCE.

If $s \to \infty$, then the asymptotic behavior of (4)-(7) has the form:

$$R(s,1) \ \geq \ \underline{R}(s,1) = \frac{1}{s^2 \log_2 e}(1+o(1)) = \frac{0,693}{s^2}(1+o(1)). \tag{8}$$

Here and below, $e = 2,718$ is the base of the natural logarithm.

Obviously [3], $R(s,1) \leq 1/s$, $s = 1,2,\ldots$, and the best known upper bound on $R(s,1)$ was constructed in [12]. This upper bound is called a *recurrent bound* and it will be denoted by the symbol $\overline{R}(s,1)$, $s = 1,2,\ldots$. For its description, we introduce the standard notation of binary entropy

$$h(v) \ \triangleq -v \ \log_2 v - (1-v)\log_2(1-v), \qquad 0 < v < 1, \tag{9}$$

and for each integer $s$, $s \geq 1$, define the following function:

$$f_s(v) \triangleq h(v/s) - v\, h(1/s), \quad 0 < v < 1, \quad s = 1,2,\ldots. \tag{10}$$

Evidently [12], for any value of argument $v$, $0 < v < 1$, the function $f_s(v)$ is positive and $\cap$-convex. In addition, its maximal value

$$\max_{0<v<1} \ f_s(v) \ = \ f_s(v_s) \quad \text{where} \quad v_s \triangleq \frac{s}{1+2^{s\cdot h\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)}}, \quad s = 1,2,\ldots. \tag{11}$$

Put

$$\overline{R}(1,1) \triangleq 1, \quad \overline{R}(2,1) \triangleq \max_{0<v<1} \ f_2(v) \ = \ f_2(v_2) \ = \ 0,322, \tag{12}$$

and for $s = 3,4,\ldots$, the sequence $\overline{R}(s,1)$ is defined [12] (see, also [13]) as the unique root of the following recurrent equation:

$$\overline{R}(s,1) = \ f_s\left(1 - \frac{\overline{R}(s,1)}{\overline{R}(s-1,1)}\right), \quad s = 3,4,\ldots. \tag{13}$$

In [12], we proved the inequalities

$$R(s,1) \ \leq \ \overline{R}(s,1) \ \leq \ \frac{2\log_2[e(s+1)/2]}{s^2}, \qquad s = 2,3,\ldots, \tag{14}$$

which yield the asymptotic upper bound:

$$R(s,1) \ \leq \ \frac{2\log_2 s}{s^2}\,(1+o(1)), \quad s \to \infty. \tag{15}$$

For $s = 2,3,\ldots,6$, the numerical values of the lower bound $\underline{R}(s,1)$ defined by (4)-(7) and the upper bound $\overline{R}(s,1)$ defined by (12)-(13) are given in Table 1.

In Sect. 2.1, we prove

**Theorem 1.** *If $s \geq 8$, then the recurrent sequence $\overline{R}(s,1)$ satisfies the inequality*

$$\overline{R}(s,1) \ \geq \ \frac{2\log_2[(s+1)/8]}{(s+1)^2}, \qquad s \geq 8. \tag{16}$$

From (14) and (16), it follows that the asymptotic equality is

$$\overline{R}(s,1) \ = \ \frac{2\log_2 s}{s^2}\,(1+o(1)), \quad s \to \infty. \tag{17}$$

For classical superimposed $s$-codes, the main result of our work is presented by

**Theorem 2.** *For the rate $R(s,1)$, the asymptotic inequality takes place*:

$$R(s,1) \geq \frac{4e^{-2}\log_2 s}{s^2}(1+o(1)) = \frac{0,542\ \log_2 s}{s^2}(1+o(1)), \qquad s \to \infty. \tag{18}$$

Our new lower bound (18) essentially improves inequality (8). To within a constant factor $a$, $4e^{-2} \leq a \leq 2$, bounds (15) and (18) establish the asymptotic behavior for the rate $R(s,1)$ of superimposed $s$-codes. It is important to note that Theorem 2 will be proved in Sect. 2.2 as a consequence of lower bounds on the rate $R(s,\ell)$ for CF $(s,\ell)$-codes at $\ell \geq 2$. These lower bounds are formulated in Sect. 1.2 and will be constructed in Sect. 2.2 using a random coding method based on the ensemble of binary constant weight codes.

## 1.2 Upper and Lower Bounds on $R(s,\ell)$ for $2 \leq \ell \leq s$

Superimposed cover-free $(s,\ell)$-codes (CF $(s,\ell)$-codes) were introduced in [1]. The first upper bounds on $R(s,\ell)$ for CF $(s,\ell)$-codes, $2 \leq \ell \leq s$, were obtained in [13]-[14]. In papers [15]-[16], the following recurrent inequality was proved:

$$R(s,\ell) \ \leq \ \frac{R(s-i,\ell-j)}{R(s-i,\ell-j)+\frac{(i+j)^{i+j}}{i^i\cdot j^j}}, \quad i \in [s-1],\ j \in [\ell-1], \tag{19}$$

which can be considered as an improvement of the recurrent inequality

$$R(s,\ell) \ \leq \ R(s-i,\ell-j)\cdot\frac{i^i\cdot j^j}{(i+j)^{i+j}}, \quad i \in [s-1],\ j \in [\ell-1], \tag{20}$$

established in [17]. The recurrent inequality (19) and the recurrent upper bound $\overline{R}(s,1)$, $s \geq 1$, defined by (10)-(13), yield the best known upper bound on $R(s,\ell)$ having the following recurrent form:

$$R(s,\ell) \leq \overline{R}(s,\ell) \triangleq \min_{i\in[s-1]}\min_{j\in[\ell-1]}\frac{\overline{R}(s-i,\ell-j)}{\overline{R}(s-i,\ell-j)+\frac{(i+j)^{i+j}}{i^i\cdot j^j}}, \quad 2 \leq \ell \leq s. \tag{21}$$

The asymptotic consequence of (21) proved in Sect. 2.2 is given by

**Theorem 3.** [18]. *If $s \to \infty$ and $\ell \geq 2$ is fixed, then*

$$R(s,\ell) \ \leq \ \overline{R}(s,\ell) \ \leq \ \frac{(\ell+1)^{\ell+1}}{2\,e^{\ell-1}}\cdot\frac{\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}\cdot(1+o(1)), \quad \ell \geq 2, \quad s \to \infty. \tag{22}$$

Up to now, the best known lower bound for $R(s,\ell)$, $2 \leq \ell \leq s$, was obtained in [13] with the help of a random coding method based on the standard ensemble with independent components of binary codewords and a special ensemble with independent constant weight codewords suggested in [19]. For fixed $\ell \geq 2$ and $s \to \infty$, the asymptotic behavior of this lower bound can be written [13] as follows

$$R(s,\ell) \ \geq \ \frac{e^{-\ell}\ell^{\ell+1}\log_2 e}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)), \quad \ell \geq 2, \quad s \to \infty. \tag{23}$$

The central result of our paper is a new random coding bound for $R(s,\ell)$, $2 \le \ell \le s$. The bound is formulated below as Theorem 4 and will be proved in Sect. 2.2. The given lower bound is based on the ensemble of binary codes with independent constant weight codewords.

**Theorem 4.** (Random coding bound $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$.) *The following two statements take place.*
**1.** *Let $2 \le \ell \le s$. Then the rate of CF $(s,\ell)$-codes*

$$R(s,\ell) \ge \underline{R}(s,\ell) \triangleq \frac{1}{s+\ell-1} \max_{0<z<1} T(z,s,\ell), \tag{24}$$

$$T(z,s,\ell) \triangleq \frac{\ell z^s (1-z)^\ell}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell} \log_2 \left[\frac{z}{1-z}\right] + (s+\ell-1)\times$$
$$\times \log_2 \left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right] - (s+\ell)\, \frac{z-z^s(1-z)^\ell}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell} \log_2 \left[1-z^{s-1}(1-z)^\ell\right]. \tag{25}$$

**2.** *If $s \to \infty$ $\ell \ge 2$ is fixed, then the lower bound $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$ satisfies the asymptotic equality:*

$$\underline{R}(s,\ell) = \frac{e^{-\ell}\ell^{\ell+1}\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)). \quad s \to \infty, \quad \ell = 2,3,\dots. \tag{26}$$

In Sect. 2.2, with the help of Theorem 4 we prove

**Theorem 5.** *For any fixed $\ell = 1,2,\dots$ and $s \to \infty$, the rate $R(s,\ell)$ satisfies the asymptotic inequality*

$$R(s,\ell) \ge \left(\frac{\ell+1}{e}\right)^{\ell+1} \frac{\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)), \qquad \ell = 1,2,\dots, \quad s \to \infty. \tag{27}$$

Theorem 5 essentially improves the asymptotic behavior of the lower bound (23). From Theorem 5 follows Theorem 2 because inequality (18) of Theorem 2 is the particular case of (27) at $\ell = 1$. From the evident comparison of the upper bound (22) with the lower bound (27) the result formulated in the abstract of our paper follows.

For fixed $s \ge 2$, any $i = 1,2,\dots$ and any integer parameter $j$, $2 \le j \le s$, inequality (19) can be written in the form

$$R(s+i,j) \le \frac{R(s,1)}{R(s,1) + \frac{(i+j-1)^{i+j-1}}{i^i (j-1)^{j-1}}}, \quad 2 \le j \le s,\ i = 1,2,\dots$$

or

$$R(s,1) \ge \frac{R(s+i,j)}{1-R(s+i,j)} \frac{(i+j-1)^{i+j-1}}{i^i\,(j-1)^{j-1}}, \quad 2 \le j \le s,\ i = 1,2,\dots.$$

Therefore, the rate of superimposed $s$-codes

$$R(s,1) \ge \underline{R}'(s,1) \triangleq \max_{i \ge 1,\, 2 \le j \le s} \left\{ \frac{\underline{R}(s+i,j)}{1-\underline{R}(s+i,j)} \frac{(i+j-1)^{i+j-1}}{i^i (j-1)^{j-1}} \right\}. \tag{28}$$

In the right-hand side of (28), the lower bound of Theorem 4 is used. In Table 1, for $\ell = 1$ and $2 \le s \le 6$, we give the numerical values of the lower bound $\underline{R}'(s,1)$ along with the optimal parameters $(i,j)$ from definition (28). For $3 \le s \le 6$, the given values improve the lower bound $\underline{R}(s,1)$ defined by (4)-(7). For $2 \le \ell \le s \le 6$, Table 1 also gives the values of the upper bound

$\overline{R}(s,\ell)$, defined by (21), and the values of the lower bound $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$ along with the values of optimal relative weight $Q(s,\ell)$ for the ensemble used in Theorem 4. In the proof of Theorem 4, the following asymptotic equality will be established

$$Q(s,\ell) = \frac{\ell}{s}\,(1+o(1)), \quad s \to \infty, \quad \ell = 2,3,\ldots. \tag{29}$$

Table 1:

| $(s,1)$ | $(2,1)$ | $(3,1)$ | $(4,1)$ | $(5,1)$ | $(6,1)$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\overline{R}(s,1)$ | $3,22\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,99\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,40\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,06\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $8,30\cdot 10^{-2}$ |
| $\underline{R}(s,1)$ | $1,82\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $7,9\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $4,4\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $2,8\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $1,9\cdot 10^{-2}$ |
| $\underline{R'}(s,1)$ | $1,28\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $8,2\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $5,66\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $4,20\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $3,246\cdot 10^{-2}$ |
| $(i,j)$ | $(1,2)$ | $(2,2)$ | $(3,2)$ | $(3,2)$ | $(4,2)$ |
| $(s,\ell)$ | $(2,2)$ | $(3,2)$ | $(4,2)$ | $(5,2)$ | $(6,2)$ |
| $\overline{R}(s,\ell)$ | $1,61\cdot 10^{-1}$ | $7,44\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $4,55\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $2,86\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $2,03\cdot 10^{-2}$ |
| $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$ | $5,84\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $3,1\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $1,85\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $1,2\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $8,25\cdot 10^{-3}$ |
| $Q(s,\ell)$ | $0,32$ | $0,27$ | $0,24$ | $0,21$ | $0,19$ |
| $(s,\ell)$ | $(3,3)$ | $(4,3)$ | $(5,3)$ | $(6,3)$ | $(4,4)$ |
| $\overline{R}(s,\ell)$ | $3,87\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $1,83\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $1,09\cdot 10^{-2}$ | $6,69\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $9,58\cdot 10^{-3}$ |
| $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$ | $9,78\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $5,53\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $3,36\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $2,15\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $1,92\cdot 10^{-3}$ |
| $Q(s,\ell)$ | $0,34$ | $0,31$ | $0.28$ | $0,26$ | $0,35$ |
| $(s,\ell)$ | $(5,4)$ | $(6,4)$ | $(5,5)$ | $(6,5)$ | $(6,6)$ |
| $\overline{R}(s,\ell)$ | $4,55\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $2,56\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $2,39\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $1,14\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $5,97\cdot 10^{-4}$ |
| $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$ | $1,1\cdot 10^{-3}$ | $6,71\cdot 10^{-4}$ | $4,04\cdot 10^{-4}$ | $2,34\cdot 10^{-4}$ | $8,83\cdot 10^{-5}$ |
| $Q(s,\ell)$ | $0,32$ | $0,30$ | $0,37$ | $0,35$ | $0,38$ |

### 1.3 Bounds on the Rate $R_L(s)$ for LD $s_L$-Codes

Superimposed list-decoding codes (LD $s_L$-codes) were introduced in [2] where nontrivial bounds on the rate $R_L(s)$ were obtained. Some constructions were considered in [5] (see, also [20]-[22]) in connection with two-stage pooling designs arising from the potentialities of molecular biology to identify any $p$-subset, $p \le s$, of positive clones in the clone-library of size $t$. From Definition 2, follows the possibility of applying an LD $s_L$-code $X$ of size $t$ and length $N$ at the first screening stage. Then, in a confirmatory (second) screening stage, $\le s+L-1$ candidates are confirmed individually. In other words, if the number of positive clones $\le s$, then the two stage list decoding algorithm needs to carry out $\le N+s+L-1$ tests (pools). Note, that at fixed $s \ge 2$, the rate of two-stage pooling designs $R_L(s)$ is an increasing function of parameter $L \ge 1$ and, hence, the number

$$R_\infty(s) \triangleq \lim_{L\to\infty} R_L(s), \qquad s = 2,3,\ldots, \tag{30}$$

can be interpreted as the *maximal rate* for two-stage group testing in the disjunct search model of $p$, $p \le s$, positives.

The following important properties of LD $s_L$-codes arise immediately from Definition 2.

**Proposition 1.** [2]. Let $X$ be an arbitrary $s_L$-code of length $N$ and size $t$. Let $M_s(\boldsymbol{y}, X)$, $\boldsymbol{y} \in \{0,1\}^N$, denote the set of $s$-collections of codewords of $X$ such that for any $s$-collection from

$M_s(\boldsymbol{y}, X)$, the disjunct sum of its $s$ codewords is equal to $\boldsymbol{y}$. Using Definition 2 and obvious arguments by contradiction, we obtain that for any $\boldsymbol{y} \in \{0,1\}^N$, the size $|M_s(\boldsymbol{y}, X)| \le \binom{s+L-1}{s}$. Since the number of all $s$-collections of codewords of $X$ is equal to $\binom{t}{s}$, then

$$\binom{t}{s} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} |M_s(\boldsymbol{y}, X)| \le \binom{s+L-1}{s} 2^N.$$

According to definition (3), these inequalities lead to lower and upper bounds:

$$N_{ld}(t, s, L) \ge \log_2 \frac{\binom{t}{s}}{\binom{s+L-1}{s}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \left(R_L(s) \le \frac{1}{s}\right), \quad s \ge 1, \quad L \ge 1. \tag{31}$$

**Proposition 2.** Let $s > L \ge 2$, and $X$ be an arbitrary LD $s_L$-code of length $N$ and size $t$. A column (codeword) of $X$ is called an $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-*bad* column for $X$, if $X$ contains $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$ other columns such that their disjunct sum covers the given column. Otherwise, we say that the column is $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-*good* column for $X$ and, obviously, the set of all $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-good columns for $X$ is a classical superimposed $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-code. Note that an LD $s_L$-code $X$ can contain not more than $L-1$ of $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-bad columns. Indeed, if there exists an $L$-collection of $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-bad columns of $X$, then the given $L$-collection is covered by a disjunct sum of $\le L \cdot \lfloor s/L \rfloor \le s$ columns of $X$. This contradicts the definition of LD $s_L$-code. In other words, any $s_L$-code of size $t$ and length $N$ contains at least $t-(L-1)$ codewords constituting a superimposed $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-code of length $N$. Therefore, the maximal size $t_{ld}(N, s, L)$ and the rate $R_L(s)$ satisfy the inequalities

$$t_{ld}(N, s, L) \le t_{ld}(N, \lfloor s/L \rfloor, 1) + L - 1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad R_L(s) \le R(\lfloor s/L \rfloor, 1), \quad L \le s. \tag{32}$$

**Proposition 3.** [2]. If all $\binom{t}{s}$ disjunct sums corresponding to different $s$-collections of columns of a code $X$ are distinct, then the code $X$ is an LD $(s-1)_2$-code. The given sufficient condition for LD $(s-1)_2$-code is, evidently, proved by contradiction.

The first results about the upper and lower bounds on the rate $R_L(s)$ for $L \ge 2$ were published in [2]. The upper bound on $R_L(s)$ was obtained as an obvious consequence of the second inequality in (32) and the upper bound (14). The lower bound on $R_L(s)$ was proved by a random coding method based on the standard ensemble of binary codewords with independent components.

In consequent works [23]-[24], the given bounds were improved and the best known upper and lower bounds on the rate $R_L(s)$ are presented below in the form of Theorem 6 and Theorem 7. They will be proved in Sect. 2.3 of the given paper. Without the proof, Theorems 6 was previously formulated in survey [24].

**Theorem 6.** (Recurrent upper bound $\overline{R}_L(s)$). *The following three statements take place.* **1.** *For any fixed $L \ge 1$, the rate of LD $s_L$-codes $R_L(s) \le \overline{R}_L(s)$, $s = 1, 2, \ldots$, and the sequence $\overline{R}_L(s)$, $s = 1, 2, \ldots$, is defined recurrently:*

- *if $1 \le s \le L$, then*

$$\overline{R}_L(s) \triangleq 1/s, \qquad s = 1, 2, \ldots, L; \tag{33}$$

- *if $s \ge L+1$, then*

$$\overline{R}_L(s) \triangleq \min\{1/s;\, r_L(s)\}, \qquad s = L+1, L+2, \ldots, \tag{34}$$

*and $r_L(s)$ is the unique root of the equation*

$$r_L(s) \triangleq \max_{(36)} f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v), \qquad s = L+1, L+2, \ldots, \tag{35}$$

*where the function $f_n(v)$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, of parameter $v$, $0 < v < 1$, is defined by* (9) – (10) *and the maximum is taken over all $v$ satisfying the condition*

$$0 < v < 1 - \frac{r_L(s)}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)}; \tag{36}$$

- *if $s > 2L$, then equation* (35) *can be written in the form of the equality*:

$$r_L(s) = f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(1 - \frac{r_L(s)}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)}\right), \quad L \geq 1, \quad s > 2L. \tag{37}$$

**2.** *For any $L \geq 1$, there exists an integer $s(L) \geq 2$ that*

$$\overline{R}_L(s) = \begin{cases} 1/s & \text{if} \quad s = s(L) - 1, \\ < 1/s & \text{if} \quad s \geq s(L), \end{cases}$$

*and $s(L) = L \log_2 L$ at $L \to \infty$.* **3.** *If $L \geq 1$ is fixed and $s \to \infty$, then*

$$\overline{R}_L(s) = \frac{2L \log_2 s}{s^2}(1 + o(1)). \tag{38}$$

The recurrent bound (33)-(37) and asymptotic behavior (38) are generalizations of the recurrent bound (12)-(13) and the asymptotic behavior (17).

**Theorem 7.** (Random coding bound $\underline{R}_L(s)$). *The following three statements take place.* **1.** *The rate of LD $s_L$-codes*

$$R_L(s) \geq \underline{R}_L(s) \triangleq \frac{1}{s + L - 1} \max_{0 < Q < 1} A_L(s, Q), \tag{39}$$

$$A_L(s, Q) \triangleq \log_2 \frac{Q}{1-y} - sK(Q, 1-y) - L\,K\left(Q, \frac{1-y}{1-y^s}\right), \quad s \geq 1,\ L \geq 1, \tag{40}$$

*where we use the notation* (6) *and parameter $y$, $1 - Q \leq y < 1$, is defined as the unique root of the equation*

$$y = 1 - Q + Qy^s \left[1 - \left(\frac{y - y^s}{1 - y^s}\right)^L\right], \qquad 1 - Q \leq y < 1. \tag{41}$$

**2.** *For fixed $L = 1, 2, \ldots$ and $s \to \infty$, the asymptotic behavior of the random coding bound $\underline{R}_L(s)$ has the form*

$$\underline{R}_L(s) = \frac{L}{s^2 \log_2 e}(1 + o(1)). \tag{42}$$

**3.** *At fixed $s = 2, 3, \ldots$ and $L \to \infty$ there exists*

$$\underline{R}_\infty(s) \triangleq \lim_{L \to \infty} \underline{R}_L(s) = \log_2 \left[\frac{(s-1)^{s-1}}{s^s} + 1\right]. \tag{43}$$

*If* $s \to \infty$, *then* $\underline{R}_{\infty}(s) = \frac{\log_2 e}{e \cdot s}(1 + o(1)) = \frac{0{,}5307}{s}(1 + o(1))$.

**Remark 1.** For the particular case $L = 1$, the lower bound (39)-(41) and asymptotic behavior (42) coincide with the lower bound (4)-(7) and (8). In the proofs of Theorems 4 and 7, we analyze our random coding method for a constant weight code ensemble and observe why the asymptotic behavior ($s \to \infty$, $\ell \geq 2$ - fixed) of the random coding bound (26) for CF $(s, \ell)$-codes essentially differs from the asymptotic behavior ($s \to \infty$) of the random coding bound (8) for classical superimposed $s$-codes.

The right-hand side of (43) gives the best known lower bound on the maximal rate (30) for two-stage group testing in the disjunct search model. An open problem is to obtain an upper bound on the rate (30) improving the evident upper bound $R_{\infty}(s) \leq 1/s$ which follows from (31).

**Remark 2.** We would like to mention paper [25] yielding a lower bound on (30) that is better than (43) but, unfortunately, its proof contains a principal mistake.

Table 2 presents the numerical values of $\underline{R}_L(s)$ for some small values of parameters $s$ and $L$ along with the corresponding values of the optimal relative weight $Q_L(s)$ in the right-hand side of (39). In Table 2, the numerical values of the lower bound (43) are given as well. In proofs of Statements 2 and 3, we establish the following asymptotic equalities:

$$Q_L(s) = \frac{\ln 2}{s} + \frac{L \ln^2 2}{s^2} + o\left(\frac{1}{s^2}\right), \quad s \to \infty, \quad L = 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{44}$$

$$Q_L(s) = \left[\frac{s^s}{(s-1)^{s-1}} + 1\right]^{-1} + o(1), \quad L \to \infty, \quad s = 2, 3, \ldots. \tag{45}$$

Table 2:

| $(s, L)$ | $(2, 2)$ | $(2, 3)$ | $(2, 4)$ | $(2, 5)$ | $(2, 6)$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\underline{R}_L(s)$ | $2,35 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $2,59 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $2,72 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $2,81 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $2,87 \cdot 10^{-1}$ |
| $Q_L(s)$ | $0,24$ | $0,23$ | $0,23$ | $0,22$ | $0,22$ |
| $(s, L)$ | $(3, 2)$ | $(3, 3)$ | $(3, 4)$ | $(3, 5)$ | $(3, 6)$ |
| $\underline{R}_L(s)$ | $1,14 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,34 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,46 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,55 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,61 \cdot 10^{-1}$ |
| $Q_L(s)$ | $0,18$ | $0,17$ | $0,16$ | $0,16$ | $0,15$ |
| $(s, L)$ | $(4, 2)$ | $(4, 3)$ | $(4, 4)$ | $(4, 5)$ | $(4, 6)$ |
| $\underline{R}_L(s)$ | $6,84 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $8,37 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $9,40 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $1,01 \cdot 10^{-1}$ | $1,06 \cdot 10^{-1}$ |
| $Q_L(s)$ | $0,14$ | $0,13$ | $0,13$ | $0,12$ | $0,12$ |
| $(s, L)$ | $(5, 2)$ | $(5, 3)$ | $(5, 4)$ | $(5, 5)$ | $(5, 6)$ |
| $\underline{R}_L(s)$ | $4,55 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $5,74 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $6,59 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $7,22 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $7,71 \cdot 10^{-2}$ |
| $Q_L(s)$ | $0.12$ | $0.11$ | $0.11$ | $0.10$ | $0.10$ |
| $(s, L)$ | $(6, 2)$ | $(6, 3)$ | $(6, 4)$ | $(6, 5)$ | $(6, 6)$ |
| $\underline{R}_L(s)$ | $3,255 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $4,20 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $4,90 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $5,44 \cdot 10^{-2}$ | $5,86 \cdot 10^{-2}$ |
| $Q_L(s)$ | $0,10$ | $0,09$ | $0,09$ | $0,09$ | $0,09$ |
| $s$ | $2$ | $3$ | $4$ | $5$ | $6$ |
| $\underline{R}_{\infty}(s)$ | $0,322$ | $0,199$ | $0,145$ | $0,114$ | $0,094$ |

Evidently, the rate of LD $s_L$-codes $R_L(s)$ satisfies the inequality

$$\underline{R'}(s, 1) \leq R(s, 1) = R_1(s) \leq R_L(s), \qquad L = 1, 2, \ldots, \quad s = 1, 2, \ldots,$$

where the lower bound $\underline{R'}(s,1)$ is defined by (28). Hence, one can compare the lower bound $\underline{R}_L(s)$ defined by (39)-(41) with the bound $\underline{R'}(s,1)$. Tables 1-2 show that for $L=2$ and $2 \le s \le 6$, the values of $\underline{R}_2(s)$ improve (exceed) the values of $\underline{R'}(s,1)$, and it is easy to check that for $s \ge 7$, the values of $\underline{R'}(s,1)$ become greater than values of $\underline{R}_2(s)$. This corresponds to the asymptotic behavior of the given bounds. The same is also true when $L \ge 2$.

### 1.4 Disjunct Search Designs

**Definition 3.** [2]-[3]. A code $X$ is called a *disjunct $s$-design* (*$(\le s)$-design*), if the disjunct (Boolean) sum of any collection containing $s$ $(\le s)$ columns of the code $X$ differs from the disjunct sum of any other collection containing $s$ $(\le s)$ columns of the code $X$. Denote by $N(t,=s)$ $(N(t,\le s))$ the minimal number of rows for disjunct $s$-designs ($(\le s)$-designs) of size $t$. Introduce the *rate* of disjunct $s$-designs ($(\le s)$-designs):

$$R(=s) \triangleq \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \frac{\log_2 t}{N(t,=s)}, \qquad R(\le s) \triangleq \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \frac{\log_2 t}{N(t,\le s)}. \tag{46}$$

Obviously [3], the rate

$$R(\le s) \;\le\; R(=s) \le 1/s, \qquad s=1,2,\dots. \tag{47}$$

In the non-adaptive disjunct search model of $s$ $(\le s)$ defects among a set of $t$ elements, Definition 3 gives the necessary and sufficient condition for identification. Any disjunct $s$-design can be considered as the incidence matrix for a *union-free family* [26] containing $t$ subset of the set $[N]$. For any $s=2,3,\dots$, the rates (2)-(3) and (46) satisfy the following inequalities

$$R(s,1) \;\le R(\le s) \;\le\; R(s-1,1), \qquad R(=s) \;\le\; R_2(s-1), \qquad s=2,3,\dots. \tag{48}$$

The first and second inequalities were observed in [3] and the third inequality was established in [2] as the consequence of Proposition 3.

Calculations by formulas (33)-(37) give: $s(1)=2$, $s(2)=6$, $s(3)=12$, $s(4)=20$, $s(5)=25$, $s(6)=36$,.... For $L=2$, and $s=7,8,\dots,14$ we have the following values of $\overline{R}_2(s-1)$:

| $s$ | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $1/s$ | 0,143 | 0,125 | 0,111 | 0,100 | 0,091 | 0,083 | 0,077 | 0,071 |
| $\overline{R}_2(s-1)$ | 0,163 | 0,141 | 0,117 | 0,102 | 0,086 | 0,076 | 0,066 | 0,059 |

Table 3.

Table 3 shows that the upper bound $\overline{R}_2(s-1) < 1/s$ if $s \ge 11$. Therefore, the third inequality in (48) means that the rate of disjunct $s$-designs $R(=s) < 1/s$ if $s \ge 11$. For $s=2$, the nontrivial inequality $R(=2) \le 0,4998 < 1/2$ was proved in [26]. For $3 \le s \le 10$, the inequality $R(=s) < 1/s$ is our conjecture.

## 2 Proofs of Theorems

### 2.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $s = 2, 3, \ldots$ be a fixed integer, the function $f_s(x)$, $0 < x < 1$, is defined by (9)-(10), and

$$K_s \triangleq \left[ \max_{0 \le x \le \frac{K_s - K_{s-1}}{K_s}} f_s(x) \right]^{-1}, \quad s = 2, 3, \ldots, \quad K_1 \triangleq 1,$$

denotes the recurrent sequence, introduced in [12]. Note that the statement of Theorem 1, i.e., inequality (16), is equivalent to the inequality

$$K_s \le \frac{(s+1)^2}{2 \log_2[(s+1)/8]}, \qquad s \ge 8. \tag{49}$$

If $9 \le s \le 236$, then one can check (49) by computer calculations.

If $s \ge 237$, then the proof of (49) is based on the following properties of the sequence $K_s$:

$$K_s = \left[ f_s\left(1 - \frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s}\right) \right]^{-1}, \quad 1 - \frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s} < v_s, \quad s \ge 3; \tag{50}$$

$$v_s > \frac{s}{1 + se} > \frac{2}{s}, \qquad s \ge 8, \tag{51}$$

which are formulated with the help of definitions (9)-(12). For the fixed parameter $s \ge 3$, the property (50) and the first inequality in (51) were established in [12]-[13]. For $s \ge 8$, the second inequality in (51) is evident. Moreover, for $0 < x < 1$ and $s \ge 2$, the following bounds

$$\begin{aligned} f_s(x) \triangleq -\frac{x}{s}(\log_2 x - \log_2 s) - \left(1 - \frac{x}{s}\right) \log_2 \left[1 - \frac{x}{s}\right] - \frac{x}{s} \log_2 s + x \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right) \log_2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{s}\right] = \\ = -\frac{x}{s} \log_2 x + x \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right) \log_2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{s}\right] - \left(1 - \frac{x}{s}\right) \log_2 \left[1 - \frac{x}{s}\right] \ge \\ \ge -\frac{x}{s} \log_2 x + x \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right) \log_2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{s}\right] + \left(1 - \frac{x}{s}\right) \frac{x}{s} \log_2 e, \quad 0 < x < 1, \ s \ge 2, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

$$(s-1) \log_2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{s}\right] > -\log_2 e, \quad s \ge 2, \tag{53}$$

hold. They are arising from definitions (9)-(10) of function $f_s(x)$ and the standard logarithmic inequality:

$$\ln u \le u - 1, \qquad u > 0. \tag{54}$$

In the consequent proof of inequality (49) for $s \ge 237$, we analyze separately two cases. In the first case we consider values of $s$, $s \ge 237$, for which $1 - \frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s} > \frac{2}{s}$, and in the second case – values of $s$, $s \ge 237$, when $1 - \frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s} \le \frac{2}{s}$.

1. Let $s \geq 237$ and $1-\frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s} > \frac{2}{s}$. Then, applying the increasing property of $f_s(x)$, $0 < x \leq v_s$, and (50)-(53), one can easily check the following sequence of statements:

$$K_s = \frac{1}{f_s\left(1-\frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s}\right)} < \frac{1}{f_s\left(\frac{2}{s}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{\frac{2}{s^2}\log_2\left[\frac{s}{2}\right] + \frac{2\log_2 e}{s^2}\left(1-\frac{2}{s^2}\right) + \frac{2(s-1)}{s^2}\log_2\left[1-\frac{1}{s}\right]} =$$
$$= \frac{s^2}{2\log_2\left[\frac{s}{2}\right] + 2\log_2 e - \frac{4\log_2 e}{s^2} + 2(s-1)\log_2\left[1-\frac{1}{s}\right]} < \frac{s^2}{2\log_2\left[\frac{s}{4}\right]}.$$

For the first case, inequality (49) is established.

2. Let $s \geq 237$ and $1-\frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s} \leq \frac{2}{s}$. Introduce $t_s \triangleq 1-\frac{K_{s-1}}{K_s} \leq \frac{2}{s}$. In virtue of (50)-(52), we have

$$f_s(x) \geq \frac{x}{s}\left(-\log_2 x + \log_2 e - \frac{x\log_2 e}{s} + (s-1)\log_2\left[1-\frac{1}{s}\right]\right) \geq$$
$$\geq \frac{x}{s}\left(-\frac{x\log_2 e}{s} - \log_2 x\right), \quad 0 < x < 1,\ s \geq 2. \quad (55)$$

Note that the function $q_s(x) \triangleq \left(-\frac{x\log_2 e}{s} - \log_2 x\right)$ is a decreasing function for $x > 0$. Hence, $q_s(t_s) \geq q_s\left(\frac{2}{s}\right)$ because $t_s \leq \frac{2}{s}$. In virtue of (55), this gives the inequality

$$f_s(t_s) \geq \frac{t_s}{s}q_s(t_s) \geq \frac{t_s}{s}q_s\left(\frac{2}{s}\right) = \frac{t_s}{s}\left(-\frac{2\log_2 e}{s^2} + \log_2\left[\frac{s}{2}\right]\right) > 0. \quad (56)$$

One can write

$$K_s - K_{s-1} = K_s t_s = \frac{t_s}{f_s(t_s)} \leq \frac{s}{\log_2\left[\frac{s}{2}\right] - \frac{2\log_2 e}{s^2}} \leq \frac{s}{\log_2\left[\frac{s}{4}\right]}, \quad s \geq 8.$$

The first and second equalities arise from the form of notation $t_s$ and property (50). Then we apply (56) and take into account that $s \geq 8$. In other words, we obtain the recurrent inequality:

$$K_s \ \leq \ K_{s-1} \ + \ \frac{s}{\log_2\left[\frac{s}{4}\right]}, \quad s \geq 8. \quad (57)$$

For $s \geq 237$, inequality (57) leads to (49) if one can prove that

$$\frac{s^2}{2\log_2\left[\frac{s}{8}\right]} + \frac{s}{\log_2\left[\frac{s}{4}\right]} < \frac{(s+1)^2}{2\log_2\left[\frac{s+1}{8}\right]}, \quad s \geq 237. \quad (58)$$

With the help of (54) one can easily derive (58) from the inequality

$$\frac{s^2}{2\log_2\left[\frac{s}{8}\right]} + \frac{s}{\log_2\left[\frac{s}{4}\right]} < \frac{(s+1)^2}{2\left(\log_2 s + \frac{\log_2 e}{s} - 3\right)}, \quad s \geq 237. \quad (59)$$

At last, for any $s \geq 237$, inequality (59) is equivalent to the following evident inequality:

$$s\left((2-\log_2 e)\log_2 s + 2\log_2 e - 6\right) + \log_2^2 s - (5+2\log_2 e)\log_2 s + 6 + 6\log_2 e > 0.$$

Theorem 1 is proved. $\square$

## 2.2 Proof of Bounds on the Rate of CF $(s,\ell)$-Codes

### 2.2.1 Proof of Theorem 4

**Proof of Statement 1.** To obtain the lower bound on $R(s,\ell)$, $2 \le \ell \le s$, we apply the random coding method [6] based on the ensemble of binary constant weight codes. Let $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$, be a fixed parameter. We will use notations (1)-(2) introduced in Definition 1 of CF $(s,\ell)$-code $X$ of length $N$ and size $t$. For an arbitrary constant weight code $X$ of weight $w$ and any set $\mathcal{S} \subset [t]$, the symbol $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq \{\, \boldsymbol{x}(j) \,:\, j \in \mathcal{S}\}$ will denote the corresponding set of codewords (columns) of the code $X$. For any two non-intersecting sets $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{L} \subset [t]$, $|\mathcal{S}| = s$, $|\mathcal{L}| = \ell$, $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{L} = \varnothing$, the corresponding pair $(\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}), \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{L}))$ is called an $(s,\ell)$-*good pair* if there exists a row $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $i \in [N]$, for which

$$x_i(j) = 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad j \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \text{and} \quad x_i(k) = 1 \quad \text{for any} \quad k \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Otherwise, the pair $(\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}), \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{L}))$ is called an $(s,\ell)$-*bad pair*. A (codeword) column $\boldsymbol{x}(j)$, of weight $w = |\boldsymbol{x}(j)| = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{N} x_i(j)$, $j \in [t]$, is called an $(s,\ell)$-*bad column* in code $X$ if there exists an $(s,\ell)$-bad pair $(\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}), \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{L}))$ in code $X$ and the column $\boldsymbol{x}(j) \in \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{L})$.

Introduce an ensemble $E(N,t,Q)$ of binary $(N \times t)$-matrices $X$ having $N$ rows and $t$ columns, where each column $\boldsymbol{x}(j)$, $j \in [t]$, of matrix $X$ is taken independently from the set containing $\binom{N}{w}$ binary columns of weight $w \triangleq \lfloor QN \rfloor$. For ensemble $E(N,t,Q)$, the symbol $P_0(N,Q,s,\ell)$ will denote the probability of event: "a pair $(\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}), \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{L}))$ is $(s,\ell)$-bad pair" and the symbol $P_1(N,t,Q,s,\ell)$ will denote the probability of event: "a column $\boldsymbol{x}(j)$ is an $(s,\ell)$-bad column in code $X$". Obviously, for fixed $2 \le \ell \le s$, both of the probabilities do not depend on sets $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{L} \subset [t]$ and index $j \in [t]$. Consequently, the additive bound on the probability of the union of events yields:

$$P_1(N,t,Q,s,\ell) \,\le\, \binom{t-1}{s+\ell-1}\binom{s+\ell-1}{s} P_0(N,Q,s,\ell) \,\le\, \frac{t^{s+\ell-1}}{s!(\ell-1)!}\, P_0(N,Q,s,\ell).$$

This inequality implies that the average number of $(s,\ell)$-bad columns of code $X$ doesn't exceed

$$t \cdot P_1(N,t,Q,s,\ell) \,<\, t\,\frac{t^{s+\ell-1}}{s!(\ell-1)!}\, P_0(N,Q,s,\ell).$$

Therefore, for any

$$t \,<\, \left[\frac{s!(\ell-1)!}{2\,P_0(N,Q,s,\ell)}\right]^{1/(s+\ell-1)},$$

there exists an $(N \times t/2)$-matrix $X$ which is a CF $(s,\ell)$-code. Thus, the maximum size

$$t_{cf}(N,s,\ell) \,\ge\, \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2}\,\left[\frac{s!(\ell-1)!}{2\,P_0(N,Q,s,\ell)}\right]^{1/(s+\ell-1)} \right\rfloor, \quad 0 < Q < 1.$$

Hence, according to definition (2) of the rate $R(s,\ell)$, $2 \le \ell \le s$, we come to the following lower bound:

$$R(s,\ell) \ge \underline{R}(s,\ell) \triangleq \frac{1}{s+\ell-1} \max_{0<Q<1} A(s,\ell,Q), \quad A(s,\ell,Q) \triangleq \varlimsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{-\log_2 P_0(N,Q,s,\ell)}{N}. \quad (60)$$

To complete the proof of Statement 1, we need to derive an explicit formula for the function $A(s,\ell,Q)$ and to show that for any $2 \le \ell \le s$, the number $\underline{R}(s,\ell)$ defined by (60) is equal to the number defined by (24)-(25).

We will use the type terminology [8]. Consider two arbitrary sets of binary columns having the same weight $w$, namely: $\boldsymbol{x}(1),\ldots,\boldsymbol{x}(s)$ and $\boldsymbol{y}(1)\ldots,\boldsymbol{y}(\ell)$, where $\boldsymbol{x}(i),\boldsymbol{y}(j) \in \{0,\,1\}^N$ and for any $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [\ell]$, the weight $|\boldsymbol{x}(i)| = |\boldsymbol{y}(j)| = \lfloor QN \rfloor$. The first set forms an $(N \times s)$-matrix $X_s$, and the second one – an $(N \times \ell)$-matrix $Y_\ell$. Let $\mathbf{a} \triangleq (a_1,\ldots,a_s) \in \{0,\,1\}^s$ and $\mathbf{b} \triangleq (b_1,\ldots,b_\ell) \in \{0,\,1\}^\ell$. By $\{n(\mathbf{a})\}$ ($\{m(\mathbf{b})\}$) we will denote a *type* of matrix $X_s$ ($Y_\ell$). This means that $n(\mathbf{a})$, $0 \le n(\mathbf{a}) \le N$, ($m(\mathbf{b})$, $0 \le m(\mathbf{b}) \le N$) is the number of $\mathbf{a}$-rows ($\mathbf{b}$-rows) in matrix $X_s$ ($Y_\ell$). Obviously, for any matrices $X_s$ and $Y_\ell$ the sum

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a}) \;=\; \sum_{\mathbf{b}} m(\mathbf{b}) \;=\; N.$$

Note that $n\,(\boldsymbol{0})$ ($m\,(\boldsymbol{1})$) is the number of rows consisting of all zeros (ones) in $X_s$ ($Y_\ell$) and if $N - n(\boldsymbol{0}) < m(\boldsymbol{1})$, then the corresponding pair $(X_s, Y_\ell)$ is an $(s,\ell)$-good pair. Otherwise, for any fixed pair of types $(\{n(\mathbf{a})\},\,\{m(\mathbf{b})\})$, the fraction $\binom{N-n(\boldsymbol{0})}{m(\boldsymbol{1})} \,/\, \binom{N}{m(\boldsymbol{1})}$ is equal to the relative number of $(s,\ell)$-bad pairs $(X_s, Y_\ell)$. From this it follows that the probability

$$P_0(N,Q,s,\ell) = \sum_{\{n(\mathbf{a})\}} \sum_{\{m(\mathbf{b})\}} \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a})!} \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mathbf{b}} m(\mathbf{b})!} \frac{\binom{N-n(\boldsymbol{0})}{m(\boldsymbol{1})}}{\binom{N}{m(\boldsymbol{1})}} \binom{N}{\lfloor QN \rfloor}^{-s-\ell}, \tag{61}$$

where the sum is taken over all pairs of types $(\{n(\mathbf{a})\},\{m(\mathbf{b})\})$ provided

$$\begin{cases} n(\boldsymbol{0}) + m(\boldsymbol{1}) \le N; \\ 0 \le n(\mathbf{a}) \le N; \quad 0 \le m(\mathbf{b}) \le N; \\ \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a}) = \sum\limits_{\mathbf{b}} m(\mathbf{b}) = N; \\ |\boldsymbol{x}(i)| = \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i = 1} n(\mathbf{a}) = |\boldsymbol{y}(j)| = \sum\limits_{\mathbf{b}:\, b_j = 1} m(\mathbf{b}) = \lfloor QN \rfloor \quad \text{for any } i \in [s],\, j \in [\ell]. \end{cases} \tag{62}$$

Let $N \to \infty$ and $n(\mathbf{a}) \triangleq N[\tau(\mathbf{a}) + o(1)]$, $m(\mathbf{b}) \triangleq N[\upsilon(\mathbf{b}) + o(1)]$, where probability distributions $\tau \triangleq \{\tau(\mathbf{a})\}$, $\mathbf{a} \in \{0,1\}^s$ and $\upsilon \triangleq \{\upsilon(\mathbf{b})\}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ are induced by (62), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a} \in \{0,1\}^s} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = 1, \quad \sum\limits_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^\ell} \upsilon(\mathbf{b}) = 1, \quad \tau(\boldsymbol{0}) + \upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}) \le 1, \\ \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i = 1} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = Q, \quad \sum\limits_{\mathbf{b}:\, b_j = 1} \upsilon(\mathbf{b}) = Q \quad \text{for any } i \in [s],\, j \in [\ell]. \end{cases} \tag{63}$$

Applying the Stirling approximation, we obtain the following logarithmic asymptotics :

$$-\log_2 \left\{ \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a})!} \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mathbf{b}} m(\mathbf{b})!} \frac{\binom{N-n(\boldsymbol{0})}{m(\boldsymbol{1})}}{\binom{N}{m(\boldsymbol{1})}} \binom{N}{\lfloor QN \rfloor}^{-s-\ell} \right\} = N[F(\tau,\upsilon,Q) + o(1)],$$

$$F(\tau,\upsilon,Q) \triangleq \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tau(\mathbf{a}) \log_2 [\tau(\mathbf{a})] + \sum_{\mathbf{b}} \upsilon(\mathbf{b}) \log_2 [\upsilon(\mathbf{b})] - (1 - \tau\,(\boldsymbol{0}))h\left(\frac{\upsilon\,(\boldsymbol{1})}{1 - \tau\,(\boldsymbol{0})}\right) + \\ + (s+\ell)h(Q) + h(\upsilon\,(\boldsymbol{1})).$$

Let $\tau_Q \triangleq \{\tau_Q(\mathbf{a})\}$ and $\upsilon_Q \triangleq \{\upsilon_Q(\mathbf{a})\}$ be the extremal distributions with properties (63), at which the minimum of $F(\tau, \upsilon, Q)$ is attained. Hence, the logarithmic asymptotic of (61) is

$$A(s,\ell,Q) \triangleq \varlimsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{-\log_2 P_0(N,Q,s,\ell)}{N} = \min_{(\tau,\upsilon)\in(63)} F(\tau,\upsilon,Q) = F(\tau_Q,\upsilon_Q,Q). \tag{64}$$

It is sufficient to look for the minimum of the function $F \triangleq F(\tau, \upsilon, Q)$ over region (63) excluding its bounds. Thus, we investigate the minimization problem: $F \to \min$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Main function:} \qquad F(\tau,\upsilon,Q) : \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}.\\
&\text{Restrictions:} \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}\in\{0,1\}^s} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = 1;\\ \sum\limits_{\mathbf{b}\in\{0,1\}^\ell} \upsilon(\mathbf{b}) = 1;\\ \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i=1} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = Q \quad \text{for any } i \in [s];\\ \sum\limits_{\mathbf{b}:\, b_j=1} \upsilon(\mathbf{b}) = Q \quad \text{for any } j \in [\ell]. \end{cases}\\
&\text{Search region } \mathbb{X}: \begin{cases} 0 < \tau(\mathbf{a}) < 1 \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{a} \in \{0,1\}^s;\\ 0 < \upsilon(\mathbf{b}) < 1 \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^\ell;\\ \tau(\boldsymbol{0}) + \upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}) < 1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

We will find the extremal distribution $(\tau_Q, \upsilon_Q)$ applying the standard Lagrange method. The corresponding Lagrangian $\Lambda$ can be written as follows:

$$\Lambda \triangleq F(\tau,\upsilon,Q) + \lambda_0\left(\sum_{\mathbf{a}}\tau(\mathbf{a}) - 1\right) + \lambda_1\left(\sum_{\mathbf{b}}\upsilon(\mathbf{b}) - 1\right) + \\ + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\mu_i\left(\sum_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i=1}\tau(\mathbf{a}) - Q\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\nu_i\left(\sum_{\mathbf{b}:\, b_i=1}\upsilon(\mathbf{b}) - Q\right).$$

The necessary conditions for $(\tau_Q, \upsilon_Q)$ are:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial(\tau(\mathbf{a}))} = \log_2[\tau(\mathbf{a})] + \log_2 e + \lambda_0 + \sum\limits_{i:\, a_i=1}\mu_i = 0 \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0};\\ \frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial(\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))} = \log_2[\tau(\boldsymbol{0})] + \log_2 e + \lambda_0 + \log_2\left[\frac{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}\right] = 0;\\ \frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial(\upsilon(\mathbf{b}))} = \log_2[\upsilon(\mathbf{b})] + \log_2 e + \lambda_1 + \sum\limits_{i:\, b_i=1}\nu_i = 0 \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{b} \neq \boldsymbol{1};\\ \frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial(\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} = \log_2[\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})] + \log_2 e + \lambda_1 + \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\ell}\nu_i + \log_2\left[\frac{1-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}\right] = 0. \end{cases} \tag{66}$$

**Remark 3.** Note that the considered condition $\ell \geq 2$ is an essential restriction for system (66). If $\ell = L = 1$, then parameters $\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}) \equiv Q$ and $\upsilon(\boldsymbol{0}) \equiv 1 - Q$ are fixed. Therefore, in the proof of Theorem 7 (see, Sect. 2.3.2) for the case $L = 1$, the similar system (113) doesn't contain the last two equations from system (66). As a result, two cases ($\ell = 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$) lead to two distinct asymptotic bounds.

For the Lagrangian $\Lambda$, the matrix of its second derivatives coincides with the same matrix for $F$ and can be described as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2\Lambda}{\partial^2(\tau(\mathbf{a}))} = \frac{\log_2 e}{\tau(\mathbf{a})} > 0 \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0};\\
&\frac{\partial^2\Lambda}{\partial^2(\upsilon(\mathbf{b}))} = \frac{\log_2 e}{\upsilon(\mathbf{b})} > 0 \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{b} \neq \boldsymbol{1};\\
&a' \triangleq \frac{\partial^2\Lambda}{\partial(\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))^2} = \frac{\log_2 e}{\tau(\boldsymbol{0})} + \frac{\log_2 e \cdot \upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}{(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} > 0;\\
&b' \triangleq \frac{\partial^2\Lambda}{\partial(\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))\partial(\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} = \frac{\log_2 e}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})} > 0;\\
&c' \triangleq \frac{\partial^2\Lambda}{\partial(\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))^2} = \frac{\log_2 e}{\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})} + \frac{\log_2 e \cdot \tau(\boldsymbol{0})}{(1-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} > 0
\end{aligned}$$

because the rest of the second derivatives are all equal to zero. The immediate calculations give

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{a'c'-b'^2}{(\log_2 e)^2} &= \frac{1}{\tau(\boldsymbol{0})\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})} + \frac{1}{(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} + \frac{1}{(1-\upsilon((\boldsymbol{1}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} +\\
&+ \frac{\tau(\boldsymbol{0})\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}{(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))(1-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))^2} - \frac{1}{(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))^2} =\\
&= \frac{1}{\tau(\boldsymbol{0})\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})} + \frac{1}{(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} + \frac{1}{(1-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} -\\
&- \frac{1}{(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))(1-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))(1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1}))} \geq \frac{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})} > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the considered matrix is positive definite and, therefore [27], the function $F$ is strictly $\cup$-convex on $\mathbb{X}$. In the space $\mathbb{R}^{2^s+2^\ell}$, restrictions (65) generate the affine subspace $\mathbb{G}$ having the dimension $\left(2^s+2^\ell-(s+\ell+2)\right)$. This implies that the function $F$ is strictly $\cup$-convex on $\mathbb{G}\cap\mathbb{X}$. In other words, any local minimum of $F$ on $\mathbb{G}\cap\mathbb{X}$ is the global and unique. Applying the Karus-Kuh-Tucker theorem [27], we get that any solution of the system (66) provided (65) is the unique solution and gives the global minimum of $F$ on $\mathbb{X}$.

Note that the symmetry of the problem yields equality: $\mu \triangleq \mu_1 = \mu_2 = ... = \mu_s$. To prove this, we need to check that $\mu_i = \mu_j$ for $i \neq j$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i \triangleq (0,\dots,1,\dots,0)$ be a row of length $s$, which has 1 at the $i$-th position and $0's$ at other positions. The permutation of indices $i$ and $j$ leads to an equivalent problem. Hence, if $(\tau_Q^1, \upsilon_Q)$ is a solution, then $(\tau_Q^2, \upsilon_Q)$ is also a solution, where the distribution $\tau_Q^2(\mathbf{a}) = \tau_Q^1(\tilde{\mathbf{a}})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ is a row, obtained by permutation of indices $i$ and $j$ from row $\mathbf{a}$. The uniqueness of the solution $\tau_Q$ implies that distribution $(\tau_Q^1, \upsilon_Q)$ coincides with distribution $(\tau_Q^2, \upsilon_Q)$. In particular, $\tau_Q^1(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_i) = \tau_Q^1(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_j)$. From the first equation of (66) follows the coincidence of Lagrange factors. Using the same argument, one can prove that $\nu \triangleq \nu_1 = \nu_2 = ... = \nu_\ell$. Introduce parameters $r_i \triangleq \log_2 e + \lambda_i$, $i = 0, 1$. Then equations (66) have the form:

$$\begin{cases}
r_0 + \mu\sum_{i=1}^s a_i + \log_2[\tau(\mathbf{a})] = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0};\\
r_0 + \log_2[\tau(\boldsymbol{0})] + \log_2\left[\frac{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}\right] = 0;\\
r_1 + \nu\sum_{i=1}^\ell b_i + \log_2[\upsilon(\mathbf{b})] = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{b} \neq \boldsymbol{1};\\
r_1 + \nu\ell + \log_2[\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})] + \log_2\left[\frac{1-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon(\boldsymbol{1})}\right] = 0.
\end{cases} \tag{67}$$

The first equation of (67) implies that

$$\tau(\mathbf{a}) = 2^{-r_0}2^{-\mu\sum a_i} = \frac{2^{-r_0}}{z^s}\prod_{i=1}^{s}\tilde{P}_1(a_i) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0},$$

where

$$\tilde{P}_1(0) \triangleq \frac{1}{1+2^{-\mu}} \triangleq z, \quad \tilde{P}_1(1) \triangleq \frac{2^{-\mu}}{1+2^{-\mu}} \triangleq 1-z.$$

From restrictions (65) it follows that

$$Q = \frac{2^{-r_0}}{z^s}\sum_{k=0}^{s-1}\binom{s-1}{k}z^{s-k-1}(1-z)^{k+1} = \frac{1-z}{2^{r_0}\,z^s} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad r_0 = \log_2\left[\frac{1-z}{Qz^s}\right].$$

Since $\tau = \{\tau(\mathbf{a})\}$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_s) \in \{0,1\}^s$, is a probability distribution, then

$$1 - \tau\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}\neq\boldsymbol{0}}\tau(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{2^{-r_0}}{z^s}\sum_{k=1}^{s}\binom{s}{k}z^{s-k}(1-z)^k = \frac{Q(1-z^s)}{1-z}.$$

Therefore, all probabilities of the optimal distribution $\tau_Q = \{\tau_Q(\mathbf{a}),\ \mathbf{a} \in \{0,1\}^s\}$ can be represented as functions of the same independent variable $z$, $0 < z < 1$:

$$\tau_Q(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{Q}{1-z}z^{s-\sum_{i=1}^{s}a_i}(1-z)^{\sum_{i=1}^{s}a_i} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0}; \quad \tau_Q\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right) = 1 - \frac{Q(1-z^s)}{1-z}. \tag{68}$$

The third equation of (67) along with restrictions (65) give similar representations of parameters $\nu$, $r_1$ and optimal distribution $\upsilon_Q = \{\upsilon_Q(\mathbf{b}),\ \mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^\ell\}$ in the form of functions of the same independent variable $u$, $0 < u < 1$:

$$\frac{1}{1+2^{-\nu}} \triangleq u, \quad r_1 = \log_2\left[\frac{1-u}{Qu^\ell}\right]$$

$$\upsilon_Q(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{Q}{1-u}u^{\ell-\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}b_j}(1-u)^{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}b_j} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{b} \neq \boldsymbol{1}; \quad \upsilon_Q\left(\boldsymbol{1}\right) = 1 - \frac{Q(1-(1-u)^\ell)}{1-u}. \tag{69}$$

A substitution of $\mu$, $r_0$, $\nu$, $r_1$, $\tau_Q\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right)$ and $\upsilon_Q\left(\boldsymbol{1}\right)$ to the second and fourth equations of (67) yields

$$\begin{cases} \log_2\left[\frac{1-z-Q(1-z^s)}{z^s}\right] + \log_2\left[\frac{(1-u)(1-z^s)}{Q(1-z)(1-(1-u)^\ell)+(1-u)(Q(1-z^s)-1+z)}\right] = 0; \\ \log_2\left[\frac{1-u-Q(1-(1-u)^\ell)}{(1-u)^\ell}\right] + \log_2\left[\frac{(1-z)(1-(1-u)^\ell)}{Q(1-z)(1-(1-u)^\ell)+(1-u)(Q(1-z^s)-1+z)}\right] = 0. \end{cases} \tag{70}$$

Note that each solution $(z,u)$ of (70) identifies the unique extremal distribution $(\tau_Q, \upsilon_Q)$. If we put $u = z$, then two equations (70) are equivalent and the system (70) has the form

$$Q = Q(z) = \frac{1-z}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}. \tag{71}$$

The map $Q(z) : (0,1) \to (0,1)$ is bijective, because for any fixed $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$, there exists the unique distribution $\tau_Q \triangleq \tau_{Q(z)} = \{\tau_{Q(z)}(\mathbf{a})\}$, which is determined by parameter $z$, and

$\tau_{Q(z_1)} \neq \tau_{Q(z_2)}$ for $z_1 \neq z_2$. Hence, to calculate the maximum in (64) over parameter $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$, we apply the equalities:

$$\max_{0<Q<1} A(s,\ell,Q) \;=\; \max_{0<Q<1} F\left(\tau_Q, \upsilon_Q, Q\right) = \max_{0<z<1} F\left(\tau_{Q(z)}, \upsilon_{Q(z)}\, Q(z)\right), \tag{72}$$

where

$$F\left(\tau_{Q(z)}, \upsilon_{Q(z)}\, Q(z)\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tau_Q(\mathbf{a}) \log_2\left[\tau_Q(\mathbf{a})\right] + \sum_{\mathbf{b}} \upsilon_Q(\mathbf{b}) \log_2\left[\upsilon_Q(\mathbf{b})\right] - \left(1 - \tau_Q\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right)\right)\times$$
$$\times\, h\left(\frac{\upsilon_Q\left(\boldsymbol{1}\right)}{1-\tau_Q\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right)}\right) + (s+\ell)h(Q) + h(\upsilon_Q\left(\boldsymbol{1}\right))\Big\}. \tag{73}$$

Put parameter $u \triangleq z$ in (69). Using (68)-(69), we obtain all five terms of the sum (73) in the form of functions of the same independent variable $z$, $0 < z < 1$:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tau_Q(\mathbf{a}) \log_2\left[\tau_Q(\mathbf{a})\right] = \left\{\sum_{k=1}^{s} \binom{s}{k} \frac{z^{s-k}(1-z)^k}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell} \log_2\left[\frac{z^{s-k}(1-z)^k}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\right]\right\} + \frac{z^s\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\times$$
$$\times \log_2\left[\frac{z^s\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\right] = \left\{\frac{s(1-z^s)-s(1-z)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2 z + \frac{s(1-z)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2[1-z] -\right.$$
$$\left. -\frac{1-z^s}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right]\right\} + \frac{sz^s\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2 z + \frac{z^s\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\times$$
$$\times \log_2\left[1-(1-z)^\ell\right] - \frac{z^s\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right] = \frac{s\left(z-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2 z +$$
$$+ \frac{s(1-z)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2[1-z] + \frac{z^s\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-(1-z)^\ell\right] - \log_2\left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right], \tag{74}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{b}} \upsilon_Q(\mathbf{b}) \log_2\left[\upsilon_Q(\mathbf{b})\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{k} \frac{z^{\ell-k}(1-z)^k}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell} \log_2\left[\frac{z^{\ell-k}(1-z)^k}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\right] + \frac{(1-z)^\ell\left(1-z^s\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\times$$
$$\times \log_2\left[\frac{(1-z)^\ell\left(1-z^s\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\right] = \frac{\ell z}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2 z + \frac{\ell\left((1-z)-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2[1-z] +$$
$$+ \frac{(1-z)^\ell(1-z^s)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-z^s\right] - \log_2\left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right], \tag{75}$$

$$-\left(1-\tau_Q\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right)\right)h\left(\frac{\upsilon_Q\left(\boldsymbol{1}\right)}{1-\tau_Q\left(\boldsymbol{0}\right)}\right) = -\left(1-\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{0})\right)\log_2\left[1-\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{0})\right] + \upsilon_Q(\boldsymbol{1})\log_2\left[\upsilon_Q(\boldsymbol{1})\right] +$$
$$+ \left(1-\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon_Q(\boldsymbol{1})\right)\log_2\left[1-\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{0})-\upsilon_Q(\boldsymbol{1})\right] = \frac{\ell\left(1-z^s\right)(1-z)^\ell}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-z\right] +$$
$$+ \frac{\left(1-z^s\right)\left(1-(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-(1-z)^\ell\right], \tag{76}$$

$$(s+\ell)h(Q) = (s+\ell)\log_2\left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right] - \frac{(s+\ell)(1-z)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2[1-z] -$$
$$- \frac{(s+\ell)\left(z-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2 z - \frac{(s+\ell)\left(z-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-z^{s-1}(1-z)^\ell\right], \quad (77)$$

$$h(v_Q(\mathbf{1})) = -\frac{(1-z)^\ell(1-z^s)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[\frac{(1-z)^\ell(1-z^s)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\right] - \frac{1-(1-z)^\ell}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\times$$
$$\times\log_2\left[\frac{1-(1-z)^\ell}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\right] = \log_2\left[1-z^s(1-z)^\ell\right] - \frac{1-(1-z)^\ell}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2\left[1-(1-z)^\ell\right] -$$
$$- \frac{\ell(1-z)^\ell(1-z^s)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2[1-z] - \frac{(1-z)^\ell(1-z^s)}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell}\log_2[1-z^s]. \quad (78)$$

Substituting (74)-(78) to (73) and collecting similar terms, we get

$$F\left(\tau_{Q(z)}, v_{Q(z)}\,Q(z)\right) = T(z,s,\ell), \quad 0<z<1, \quad 2\le\ell\le s, \quad (79)$$

where the function $T(z,s,\ell)$ was defined in Theorem 4 by formula (25). Thus, from (60), (72) and (79) it follows that the rate of CF $(s,\ell)$-codes

$$R(s,\ell) \ge \underline{R}(s,\ell) \triangleq \frac{1}{s+\ell-1}\max_{0<z<1} T(z,s,\ell). \quad (80)$$

Statement 1 is proved.

**Proof of Statement 2.** Substituting $z=\frac{s}{s+\ell}$ to (80) and applying definition (25), we obtain

$$\underline{R}(s,\ell) \ge \frac{1}{s+\ell-1}T\left(\frac{s}{s+\ell}, s, \ell\right) = \frac{e^{-\ell}\ell^{\ell+1}\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}\left(1+o(1)\right), \quad s\to\infty,\ \ell\ge 2. \quad (81)$$

To complete the proof of Statement 2, i.e., to establish the asymptotic equality (26), it is sufficient to check that inequality (81) is the asymptotic equality. If $\ell\ge 2$ is fixed and $s\to\infty$, then an asymptotic consequence of definition (25) can be written in the form:

$$\max_{0<z<1} T(z,s,\ell) \le \max_{0<z<1}\left\{z^s(1-z)^\ell\left(\ell\log_2\left[\frac{z}{1-z}\right]+1\right)\right\}(1+o(1)).$$

Calculating the derivative of the maximized function in the right-hand side with respect to $z$, one can check that the maximal value is attained, when

$$z = \frac{s}{s+\ell} + \frac{\ell\log_2 e}{(s+\ell)\left(\ell\log_2\left[\frac{z}{1-z}\right]+1\right)}.$$

Therefore, if $\ell\ge 2$ is fixed and $s\to\infty$, then

$$\max_{0<z<1} T(z,s,\ell) \le \left(\frac{s}{s+\ell}\right)^s\left(\frac{\ell}{s+\ell}\right)^\ell \ell\log_2\left[\frac{s}{\ell}\right](1+o(1)) = \frac{e^{-\ell}\ell^{\ell+1}\log_2 s}{s^\ell}(1+o(1)). \quad (82)$$

From (80) and (82) it follows that the random coding bound

$$\underline{R}(s,\ell) = \frac{1}{s+\ell-1}\max_{0<z<1} T(z,s,\ell) \le \frac{e^{-\ell}\ell^{\ell+1}\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)), \quad s\to\infty, \quad \ell\ge 2.$$

Hence, the asymptotic equality (26) is proved. To establish the asymptotic behavior (29) of the optimal relative weight $Q(s,\ell)$ for the ensemble used in Theorem 4, we substitute $z = \frac{s}{s+\ell}$ to (71) and get

$$Q(s,\ell) = \frac{1-z}{1-z^s(1-z)^\ell} = \frac{\ell}{s}(1+o(1)), \quad s \to \infty, \quad \ell = 2,3,\ldots.$$

Statement 2 is proved. Theorem 4 is proved. $\square$

### 2.2.2 Proof of Theorem 5

Let $s \geq k > \ell \geq 1$. For a fixed parameter $p > 0$ such that $ps$ is an integer, the inequality (20) can be written in the form

$$R(s+sp,k) \;\leq\; R(s,\ell)\,\frac{(sp)^{sp}(k-\ell)^{k-\ell}}{(sp+k-\ell)^{sp+k-\ell}}.$$

From this it follows that

$$R(s,\ell) \geq \sup_{p>0,\,k>\ell}\left\{R((1+p)s,k)\frac{(sp+k-\ell)^{sp+k-\ell}}{(sp)^{sp}(k-\ell)^{k-\ell}}\right\}.$$

If $\ell \geq 2$ is fixed and $s \to \infty$, then applying the asymptotic lower bound (26) to the rate $R((1+p)s,k)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
R(s,\ell) &\geq \sup_{p>0,\,k>\ell}\left\{\frac{e^{-k}k^{k+1}\log_2\left[s(1+p)\right]}{(s(1+p))^{k+1}}\frac{(sp+k-\ell)^{sp+k-\ell}}{(sp)^{sp}(k-\ell)^{k-\ell}}\right\}(1+o(1)) = \\
&= \sup_{p>0,\,k>\ell}\left\{\frac{e^{-k}k^{k+1}p^{k-\ell}\left(1+\frac{k-\ell}{sp}\right)^{sp+k-\ell}}{(1+p)^{k+1}(k-1)^{k-1}}\right\}\frac{\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)) = \\
&= \sup_{k>\ell}\left\{\frac{e^{-\ell}k^{k+1}\left(\frac{k-\ell}{\ell+1}\right)^{k-\ell}}{\left(\frac{k+1}{\ell+1}\right)^{k+1}(k-\ell)^{k-\ell}}\right\}\frac{\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)) = \left(\frac{\ell+1}{e}\right)^{\ell+1}\frac{\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}}(1+o(1)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we took into account that

$$\max_{p>0}\;\frac{p^{k-\ell}}{(1+p)^{k+1}} \;=\; \left(\frac{k-\ell}{\ell+1}\right)^{k-\ell}\cdot\left(\frac{k+1}{\ell+1}\right)^{-k-1}$$

and the maximal value is attained at $p = \frac{k-\ell}{\ell+1}$.

Theorem 5 is proved. $\square$

### 2.2.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Let $s \geq \ell \geq 2$. Assume that $p$, $0 < p < 1$, is a fixed number and $sp$ is an integer. In the right-hand side of inequality (20), we put parameters $j \triangleq \ell - 1$, $i \triangleq ps$ and obtain

$$R(s,\ell) \;\leq\; R(s(1-p),1)\cdot\frac{(ps)^{ps}\cdot(\ell-1)^{\ell-1}}{(ps+\ell-1)^{ps+\ell-1}}.$$

Let $s \to \infty$ and $\ell \geq 2$ is fixed. Applying to the rate $R(s(1-p),1)$ the upper bound (14) and the asymptotic equality (17), we can write

$$R(s,\ell) \leq \min_{0<p<1} \left\{ \frac{2\log_2[s(1-p)]}{s^2(1-p)^2} \cdot \frac{(ps)^{ps} \cdot (\ell-1)^{\ell-1}}{(ps+\ell-1)^{ps+\ell-1}} \right\} (1+o(1)) = \frac{(\ell+1)^{\ell+1}}{2e^{\ell-1}} \cdot \frac{\log_2 s}{s^{\ell+1}} (1+o(1)),$$

where we took into account that

$$\max_{0<p<1} \left\{ (1-p)^2 \, p^{\ell-1} \right\} \; = \; (\ell-1)^{\ell-1} \, \frac{4}{(\ell+1)^{\ell+1}}$$

and the maximal value is attained at $p = \frac{\ell-1}{\ell+1}$.

Theorem 3 is proved. $\square$

## 2.3 Proofs of Bounds on the Rate of LD $s_L$-Codes

### 2.3.1 Proof of Theorem 6

**Proof of Statement 1.** Inequality (31) from Proposition 1 gives Statement 1 of Theorem 6 for $1 \le s \le L$. Let $s > L$ and $X$ be an arbitrary LD $s_L$-code of size $t$ and length $N$. If the code $X$ contains at least one codeword of weight $w$, $1 \le w \le N$, then the arguments used in [12]-[13] for the particular case $L = 1$ lead to the inequality

$$w \le N - N_{ld}(t-1, s-1, L), \tag{83}$$

where $N_{ld}(t, s, L)$ denotes the minimal length of LD $s_L$-codes of size $t$ (see, Definition 2). Bound (83) and the first inequality in (32) along with the upper bound obtained in [12]-[13] on the number of codewords of a superimposed $\lfloor s/L \rfloor$-code having the fixed weight $w$, $w \ge \lfloor s/L \rfloor + 1$, yield the following upper bound on the size $t$ of any LD $s_L$-code:

$$t \le N_{ld}(t,s,L) + \sum_{w=\lfloor s/L \rfloor+1}^{N_{ld}(t,s,L)-N_{ld}(t-1,s-1,L)} \frac{s^2}{L^2} \frac{\binom{N_{ld}(t,s,L)}{\lceil q \rceil}}{\binom{\lfloor q \rfloor \lfloor s/L \rfloor}{\lfloor q \rfloor}} + L - 1, \quad q = \frac{w}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}. \tag{84}$$

Here and below, we will use notations (33)-(36). If $t \to \infty$, then with the help of (84) and analytical arguments similar to [12]-[13], we get

$$\frac{\log_2 t}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)} \le \max_{0 \le v \le 1 - \frac{N_{ld}(t-1,s-1,L)}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)}} f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v) \cdot (1 + o(1)), \quad s > L, \quad t \to \infty. \tag{85}$$

Now we will show that the rate of LD $s_L$-codes $R_L(s) \le \overline{R}_L(s)$ for $s > L$. It is sufficient to prove by induction that $R_L(s) \le r_L(s)$ for $s > L$. The induction base is

$$R_L(L+1) \le r_L(s). \tag{86}$$

To check (86), we need to show that if $s = L + 1$, then the trivial bound is better than the recurrent one, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{L+1} \le r_L(L+1). \tag{87}$$

For any $s = 2, 3, \ldots$, introduce an auxiliary function of argument $x$, $0 < x < 1$:

$$G_s(x) \triangleq x - \max_{0 \le v \le 1 - \frac{x}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)}} f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v), \quad 0 < x < 1. \tag{88}$$

From definition (88) it follows immediately that $G_s(x)$, $0 < x < 1$, is an increasing function and has a unique zero which is equal to $r_L(s)$. Hence, to prove (87) it is sufficient to show that $G_{L+1}\left(\frac{1}{L+1}\right) \le 0$. Indeed, applying (52)-(53) observed in the proof of Theorem 1, we have:

$$G_{L+1}\left(\frac{1}{L+1}\right) = \frac{1}{L+1} - \max_{0 \le v \le 1 - \frac{L}{L+1}} f_1(v) \le \frac{1}{L+1} - f_1\left(\frac{1}{L+1}\right) \le$$

$$\le \frac{1}{L+1} - \frac{1}{L+1} T_1\left(\frac{1}{L+1}\right) \le \frac{1}{L+1}\left(1 - \log_2(L+1) + \frac{\log_2 e}{L+1}\right) < 0. \tag{89}$$

To check the inductive step, we will use proof by contradiction. One can write the inductive assumption and the assumption of contradiction as follows

$$R_L(s-1) \triangleq \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \frac{\log_2 t}{N_{ld}(t,s-1,L)} \le \overline{R}_L(s-1), \quad R_L(s) \triangleq \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \frac{\log_2 t}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)} > r_L(s). \tag{90}$$

Therefore, in virtue of (90), we get the sequence of statements:

$$\overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \left(1 - \frac{N_{ld}(t-1,s-1,L)}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)}\right) < \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \left(1 - \frac{N_{ld}(t-1,s-1,L)\cdot r_L(s)}{\log_2 t}\right) \le 1 - \frac{r_L(s)}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)}.$$

From this inequality, taking account of (85), it follows that the rate of LD $s_L$-codes

$$R_L(s) = \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \frac{\log_2 t}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)} \le \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} \max_{0\le v\le 1-\frac{N_{ld}(t-1,s-1,L)}{N_{ld}(t,s,L)}} f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}(v) = \max_{0\le v\le 1-\frac{r_L(s)}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)}} f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}(v) = r_L(s),$$

where for the last equality, we use definition (35)-(36) of $r_L(s)$. The obtained inequality contradicts to the second inequality in (90) and, therefore, the inductive step is proved.

To complete the proof of Statement 1, we need to establish equality (37). We will again use proof by contradiction. Note the the function $f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}(v)$ of parameter $v$, $0 < v < 1$, defined by (9)-(11) is a $\cap$-concave function which attains its maximal value at $v = v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}$. Hence, the assumption of contradiction can be written as follows:

$$r_L(s) = f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\right), \quad v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor} < 1 - \frac{r_L(s)}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)}, \quad L \ge 1, \quad s > 2L. \tag{91}$$

where we use notations and definitions (9)-(11). From (91) it follows that the extremal point

$$v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor} < 1 - \frac{f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\right)}{\overline{R}_L(s-1)} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \overline{R}_L(s-1) > \frac{f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\right)}{1 - v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}}. \tag{92}$$

We show that (92) is not true, i.e., the inequality

$$\overline{R}_L(s-1) \le \frac{f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\right)}{1 - v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}}, \quad L \ge 1, \quad s > 2L. \tag{93}$$

holds. Since $v_{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor}$ is a point at which the function $f_{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor}(v)$, $0 < v < 1$, attains its global maximum then the inductive assumption implies that

$$\overline{R}_L(s-1) \le r_L(s-1) \le f_{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor}\right), \quad L \ge 1, \quad s > 2L.$$

Therefore, to obtain (93) it is sufficient to check

$$f_{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor}\right) \le \frac{f_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\left(v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}\right)}{1 - v_{\lfloor s/L\rfloor}}, \quad L \ge 1, \quad s > 2L. \tag{94}$$

If $s \ne kL$, then $\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor = \lfloor s/L\rfloor$ and inequality (94) is evidently correct. Otherwise if $s = kL$, then $\lfloor \frac{s-1}{L}\rfloor = k-1$ and $\lfloor s/L\rfloor = k$. In this case, (94) is arising from inequalities $f_{k-1}(v_{k-1}) \le \frac{f_k(v_k)}{1-v_k}$, $k > 2$, obtained in [12]. Statement 1 is proved.

**Proof of Statement 2.** Consider the function $G_s(x)$ defined by formula (88). Taking into account the evident inequality $\overline{R}_L(s-1) \le 1/(s-1)$, $s \ge 2$, $L \ge 1$, the increasing property of function $f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v)$, $0 \le v \le 1/s$, arising from (51), and definitions (9)-(10), we obtain the following sequence of statements:

$$G_s\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) \ge \frac{1}{s} - \max_{0 \le v \le 1-\frac{s-1}{s}} f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v) = \frac{1}{s} - \max_{0 \le v \le \frac{1}{s}} f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v) = \frac{1}{s} - f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) >$$
$$> \frac{1}{s} - h\left(\frac{1}{s\,\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) > \frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{s\,\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\log_2\left[s\,\lfloor s/L \rfloor\right] - \frac{2\log_2 e}{s\,\lfloor s/L \rfloor}, \quad s > 3.$$

Hence, for any fixed $L \ge 1$, there exists an integer $s(L) \ge 3$ such that the sequence $G_s\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) > 0$ if $s > s(L)$. Then, the main property of function $G_s(x)$ says that $r_L(s) < \frac{1}{s}$ if $s > s(L)$. In particulary, for sufficiently large $L$ and $s > L\left(\log_2 L + 3\log_2\left[\log_2 L\right]\right)$, the inequality

$$\frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{s\,\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\log_2\left(e^2 s\,\lfloor s/L \rfloor\right) = \frac{1}{s}\left(1 - \frac{\log_2 \lfloor s/L \rfloor + \log_2\left[e^2 s\right]}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) > 0.$$

holds. Therefore, if $L \to \infty$, then the sequence $s(L) \le L\log_2 L(1+o(1))$.

To prove the inverse asymptotic inequality $s(L) \ge L\log_2 L(1+o(1))$, we check with the help of induction that $G_s(1/s) \le 0$ if $L < s < L\log_2 L - L$. The induction base for $s = L+1$, i.e., inequality (89), was established in Statement 1. From the inductive assumption $G_{s-1}\left(\frac{1}{s-1}\right) < 0$ it follows $\frac{1}{s-1} < r_L(s-1)$. Hence, the upper bound $\overline{R}_L(s-1) = \frac{1}{s-1}$ coincides with the trivial upper bound if $L < s < L\log_2 L - L$. The verification of the inductive step is based on the following sequence of statements:

$$G_s\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) = \frac{1}{s} - \max_{0 \le v \le 1-\frac{s-1}{s}} f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v) \;=\; \frac{1}{s} - f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) \le \frac{1}{s}\left(1 - \frac{\log_2 s - \frac{\log_2 e}{s\lfloor s/L \rfloor}}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) < 0.$$

In the first inequality, we apply the lower bound (55). In the second inequality, we take into account the condition $L < s < L\log_2 L - L$. As the final result, we obtain the asymptotic behavior: $s(L) = L\log_2 L(1+o(1))$ if $L \to \infty$. Statement 2 is proved.

**Proof of Statement 3.** Let $L \ge 1$ be a fixed integer and the recurrent sequence $K_L(s)$, $s \ge L+1$, is defined as follows:

$$K_L(L) \triangleq 1, \quad K_L(s) \triangleq \left[f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(1 - \frac{K_L(s-1)}{K_L(s)}\right)\right]^{-1}, \quad s = L+1, L+2, \ldots. \tag{95}$$

From (33)-(37) it easy to see that for any fixed $L \ge 1$, the sequence

$$r_L(s) \le \frac{1}{K_L(s)}, \quad s \ge 1, \quad \text{and} \quad r_L(s) = \frac{1}{K_L(s)}(1+o(1)) \quad \text{if} \quad s \to \infty.$$

With the help of arguments used in Theorem 1, one can get the following upper bound

$$K_L(s) \le \frac{(s+1)^2}{2L\log_2\left\lceil\frac{s+1}{8}\right\rceil}, \quad L \ge 1, \quad s \ge 8. \tag{96}$$

Hence, to prove (38) it is sufficient to check the asymptotic inequality:

$$K_L(s) \geq \frac{s^2}{2L\log_2 s}(1+o(1)), \quad L \geq 1, \quad s \to \infty. \tag{97}$$

If $s > L$, then from the $\cap$-convex property of function $f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v)$, $0 \leq v \leq 1$, it follows that

$$f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(v) \leq f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a) + (v-a)f'_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a), \quad 0 \leq v \leq 1, \quad 0 < a < 1. \tag{98}$$

In (98), we put $v \triangleq 1 - \frac{K_L(s-1)}{K_L(s)}$ and substitute the right-hand side of (98) to (95). This leads to the inequality:

$$K_L(s) \geq K_L(s-1) + \frac{1 - g_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a)K_L(s-1)}{f'_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a) + g_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a)}, \quad s > L, \quad 0 < a < 1, \tag{99}$$

where

$$g_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a) \triangleq f_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a) - af'_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}(a), \quad s > L, \quad 0 < a < 1. \tag{100}$$

The following properties of functions (10) and (100) were established in [12]-[13]:

$$g_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(\frac{2}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) \leq \frac{2\log_2 e}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor^2 - 2}, \quad s > L, \tag{101}$$

$$f'_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(\frac{2}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) + g_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(\frac{2}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) \leq \frac{\log_2\left[\frac{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}{2}\right]}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}, \quad s > L. \tag{102}$$

From (96) and (101) it follows that for sufficiently large $s > s_0$, the sequence

$$1 - g_{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\left(\frac{2}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}\right) K_L(s-1) > 0, \quad s > s_0. \tag{103}$$

Let $s > s_0$. In (99), we put $a \triangleq \frac{2}{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}$. Then taking into account (101)-(103), we get:

$$K_L(s) \geq K_L(s-1) + \frac{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}{\log_2\left[\frac{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}{2}\right]} - K_L(s-1)\frac{2\lfloor s/L \rfloor \log_2 e}{\left(\lfloor s/L \rfloor^2 - 2\right)\log_2\left[\frac{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}{2}\right]}, \quad s > s_0. \tag{104}$$

In virtue of (96), the sequence

$$K_L(s-1)\frac{2\lfloor s/L \rfloor \log_2 e}{\left(\lfloor s/L \rfloor^2 - 2\right)\log_2\left[\frac{\lfloor s/L \rfloor}{2}\right]} = o\left(\frac{s}{\log_2 s}\right), \quad s \to \infty.$$

Hence, if $L \geq 1$ is fixed and $s \to \infty$, then the recurrent inequality (104) yields

$$K_L(s) \geq \sum_{k=2L}^{s} \frac{\lfloor k/L \rfloor}{\log_2\left[\frac{\lfloor k/L \rfloor}{2}\right]}(1+o(1)) \geq \sum_{k=2L}^{s} \frac{k}{L\log_2 s}(1+o(1)) = \frac{s^2}{2L\log_2 s}(1+o(1)). \tag{105}$$

The asymptotic inequality (97) is equivalent to (105).

Statement 3 is proved. Theorem 6 is proved. $\square$

### 2.3.2 Proof of Theorem 7

**Proof of Statement 1.** Fix an arbitrary parameter $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$ along with integer parameters $s \geq 1$ and $L \geq 1$, where $s + L < t$. We use the same notations and the similar definitions that were introduced in the proof of Theorem 4. For an arbitrary constant weight code $X$ of weight $w$, length $N$, size $t$ and any set $\mathcal{S} \subset [t]$, the symbol $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq \{\, \boldsymbol{x}(j) \,:\, j \in \mathcal{S}\}$ will denote the corresponding set of codewords (columns) of the code $X$. For any two nonintersecting sets $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{L} \subset [t]$, $|\mathcal{S}| = s$, $|\mathcal{L}| = L$, $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{L} = \varnothing$, the corresponding pair $(\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{S}), \boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{L}))$ is called an $(s_L)$-*bad pair* if

$$\bigvee_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{x}(i) \succeq \bigvee_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \boldsymbol{x}(j).$$

For the ensemble $E(N, t, Q)$, the symbol $P_2(N, Q, s, L)$ will denote the probability of an $(s_L)$-bad pair. Definition (3) of the rate $R_L(s)$ of LD $s_L$-codes and arguments given in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 4 lead to the following random coding (lower) bound:

$$R_L(s) \geq \underline{R}_L(s) \triangleq \frac{1}{s + L - 1} \max_{0<Q<1} A_L(s, Q), \quad A_L(s, Q) \triangleq \varlimsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{-\log_2 P_2(N, Q, s, L)}{N}. \quad (106)$$

To complete the proof of Statement 1, we will show further that the function $A_L(s, Q)$ is described by explicit formulas (40)-(41) given in the formulation of Statement 1 of Theorem 7.

Using the terminology of types (see, proof of Theorem 4), probability $P_2(N, Q, s, L)$ can be written in the following form:

$$P_2(N, Q, s, L) = \sum_{\{n(\mathbf{a})\}} \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a})!} \binom{N - n(\boldsymbol{0})}{\lfloor QN \rfloor}^{L} \binom{N}{\lfloor QN \rfloor}^{-s-L}, \quad (107)$$

where the sum is taken over all types $\{n(\mathbf{a})\}$, $\mathbf{a} \triangleq (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_s) \in \{0, 1\}^s$, provided

$$0 \leq n(\mathbf{a}) \leq N, \quad \sum_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a}) = N, \quad \sum_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i = 1} n(\mathbf{a}) = \lfloor QN \rfloor \quad \text{for any } i \in [s]. \quad (108)$$

For the given $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$, let parameter $N \to \infty$ and $n(\mathbf{a}) \triangleq N[\tau(\mathbf{a}) + o(1)]$, where a fixed probability distribution $\tau \triangleq \{\tau(\mathbf{a})\}$, $\mathbf{a} \in \{0, 1\}^s$, is induced by conditions (108), i.e.,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \{0,1\}^s} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = 1, \quad \sum_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i = 1} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = Q \quad \text{for any } i \in [s]. \quad (109)$$

Using the Stirling's approximation for types, corresponding to the fixed distribution $\tau \triangleq \{\tau(\mathbf{a})\}$, we obtain the following logarithmic asymptotics

$$-\log_2 \left\{ \frac{N!}{\prod_{\mathbf{a}} n(\mathbf{a})!} \binom{N - n(\boldsymbol{0})}{\lfloor QN \rfloor}^{L} \binom{N}{\lfloor QN \rfloor}^{-s-L} \right\} = N[F(\tau, Q) + o(1)],$$

where

$$F = F(\tau, Q) \triangleq \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tau(\mathbf{a}) \log_2 [\tau(\mathbf{a})] - (1 - \tau(\boldsymbol{0}))\, L \cdot h\left(\frac{Q}{1 - \tau(\boldsymbol{0})}\right) + (s + L) h(Q). \quad (110)$$

For a fixed $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$, let the minimum of the function $F(\tau, Q)$ is attained at $\tau_Q = \{\tau_Q(\mathbf{a})\}$. Therefore, the logarithmic asymptotics of the sum (107) can be calculated as follows

$$A_L(s,Q) \triangleq \overline{\lim_{N\to\infty}} \frac{-\log_2 P_2(N,Q,s,L)}{N} = \min_{\tau\in(109)} F(\tau,Q) = F(\tau_Q,Q). \tag{111}$$

Thus, we need to investigate the minimization problem: $F \to \min$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Main function:} \qquad F(\tau,Q) : \mathbb{Y} \to \mathbb{R}. \\ &\text{Restrictions:} \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}\in\{0,1\}^s} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = 1; \\ \sum\limits_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i=1} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = Q \quad \text{for any } i \in [s]. \end{cases} \\ &\text{Search region: } \mathbb{Y}: \quad 0 < \tau(\mathbf{a}) < 1, \quad \mathbf{a} \in \{0,1\}^s. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

To find the extremal distribution $\tau_Q$ we apply the standard Lagrange method. The corresponding Lagrangian has the form:

$$\Lambda = F(\tau,Q) + \lambda_0 \left( \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tau(\mathbf{a}) - 1 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{s} \lambda_i \left( \sum_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i=1} \tau(\mathbf{a}) - Q \right).$$

Hence, the necessary conditions for $\tau_Q$ are

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial(\tau(\mathbf{a}))} = \log_2 [\tau(\mathbf{a})] + \log_2 e + \lambda_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i \lambda_i = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0}; \\ \frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial(\tau(\boldsymbol{0}))} = \log_2 [\tau(\boldsymbol{0})] + \log_2 e + \lambda_0 + L \log_2 \left[ \frac{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-Q} \right] = 0. \end{cases} \tag{113}$$

Using the arguments between formulas (66) and (67) in the proof of Statement 1 of Theorem 4, we obtain: if there exists a solution $\tau = \tau_Q = \{\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{x})\}$ of the system (113) provided (112), then the solution is unique and gives the minimum for function $F$ in $\mathbb{Y}$. In addition, the extremal distribution $\tau_Q = \{\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{x})\}$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \mu + \nu \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i + \log_2 \tau(\mathbf{a}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0}; \\ \mu + \log_2 \tau(\boldsymbol{0}) + L \log_2 \left[ \frac{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})}{1-\tau(\boldsymbol{0})-Q} \right] = 0, \end{cases} \tag{114}$$

where

$$\nu \triangleq \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_s, \quad \mu \triangleq \log_2 e + \lambda_0.$$

After substitution $y \triangleq \frac{1}{1+2^{-\nu}}$, $0 < y < 1$, the first equation of (114) gives

$$\tau(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{2^{-\nu \sum a_i}}{2^{\mu}} = \frac{1}{2^{\mu} y^s} (1-y)^{\sum a_i} y^{s - \sum a_i} \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{a} \neq \boldsymbol{0}. \tag{115}$$

The restriction (112) for probability distribution (115) leads to the equality

$$Q = \sum_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i=1} \tau_Q(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{2^{\mu} y^s} \sum_{\mathbf{a}:\, a_i=1} (1-y)^{\sum a_j} y^{s - \sum a_j} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{\mu} y^s} \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \binom{s-1}{k} y^{s-k-1} (1-y)^{k+1} = \frac{1-y}{2^{\mu} y^s}, \quad \text{for any} \quad i \in [s].$$

For any fixed $Q$, $0 < Q < 1$, this equality gives a connection between parameters $\nu$ and $y$, describing the extremal distribution $\tau_Q = \{\tau_Q(\boldsymbol{x})\}$:

$$\frac{1}{2^\mu y^s} = \frac{Q}{1-y} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \mu = \log_2\left[\frac{1-y}{Qy^s}\right]. \tag{116}$$

Applying (116) to the probability distribution (115), we obtain

$$1 - \tau(\boldsymbol{0}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}\neq\boldsymbol{0}} \tau(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{2^\mu y^s} \sum_{k=1}^{s} \binom{s}{k} y^{s-k}(1-y)^k = \frac{Q(1-y^s)}{1-y}.$$

Thus, the components of the extremal distribution (115) take the form of functions depending on the same independent variable $y$, $0 < y < 1$:

$$\tau_Q(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{Q}{1-y}\, y^{[s-\sum a_i]}(1-y)^{\sum a_i} \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{a} \neq 0; \quad \tau_Q(\boldsymbol{0}) = 1 - \frac{Q(1-y^s)}{1-y}. \tag{117}$$

Substituting (117) to the second equation of (114) with regard to (116), yields the equation

$$\log_2\left[\frac{1-y-Q(1-y^s)}{Qy^s}\right] + L\log_2\left[\frac{1-y^s}{y-y^s}\right] = 0, \tag{118}$$

which is equivalent to equation (41) for parameter $y$, $1-Q < y < 1$, given in Theorem 7. Equation (118) has the unique solution $y = y(s,Q)$, since for the considered $\cup$-convex Lagrange problem, there exists a unique extremal distribution (117) identified by parameter $y$, $0 < y < 1$.

To find the minimal value $F(\tau_Q, Q)$ in (111), we substitute probabilities (117) to the definition (110) of function $F(\tau, Q)$. Then, collecting similar terms in (110), we calculate $F(\tau_Q, Q)$ as the function of the independent variable $y$, $0 < y < 1$. Using notation (6), the result can be written in the form

$$F(\tau_Q, Q) = \log_2\left[\frac{Q}{1-y}\right] - sK\left(Q, 1-y\right) - LK\left(Q, \frac{1-y}{1-y^s}\right). \tag{119}$$

The lower bound (39)-(41) on the rate of LD $s_L$-codes, formulated in Theorem 7, arises from (106), (111), (118) and (119). Statement 1 is proved.

**Proof of Statement 2.** For fixed $s \geq 2$ and $L \geq 1$, we will interpret equation (41) as a function $Q$ of the argument $y$, i.e.

$$Q = Q_L(y,s) \triangleq \frac{1-y}{1-r_L(y,s)}, \quad r_L(y,s) \triangleq y^s\left[1 - \left(\frac{y-y^s}{1-y^s}\right)^L\right], \qquad 0 < y < 1. \tag{120}$$

Then, the random coding bound (39)-(41) can be written as follows

$$\underline{R}_L(s) \triangleq \frac{1}{s+L-1} \max_{0<y<1} T_L(y,s), \tag{121}$$

where

$$T_L(y,s) \triangleq (1-sQ-LQ)\log_2\left[\frac{Q}{1-y}\right] - (s+L)(1-Q)\log_2\left[\frac{1-Q}{y}\right] - L\log_2\left[1-y^s\right] + L(1-Q)\log_2\left[1-y^{s-1}\right]. \tag{122}$$

Let $L \geq 1$ be fixed and $s \to \infty$. In definitions (120) and (122), we put $y \triangleq 1 - c/s$, where a fixed parameter $c = c_L > 0$ does not depend on $s$. Then the definitional equality (121) implies that the random coding bound

$$\underline{R}_L(s) \;\geq\; \frac{1}{s+L-1}\, T_L\left(1-\frac{c}{s}, s\right), \quad c < s. \tag{123}$$

If $y = 1 - c/s$ and $s \to \infty$, then the asymptotic behavior of (120) and (122) has the form:

$$Q = Q_L\left(1-\frac{c}{s}, s\right) = \frac{c}{s}\,(1+o(1)), \quad T_L\left(1-\frac{c}{s}, s\right) = -\frac{L}{s}\, c \cdot \log_2\left(1-e^{-c}\right)(1+o(1)). \tag{124}$$

One can easily check that the maximum

$$\max_{c>0}\left\{-c \cdot \log_2\left(1-e^{-c}\right)\right\} = \frac{1}{\log_2 e}, \tag{125}$$

and the maximal value is attained at $c = \ln 2 = \frac{1}{\log_2 e} = 0,619$. For the random coding bound $\underline{R}_L(s)$ defined by (120)-(122), formulas (123)-(125) lead to the following asymptotic inequality

$$\underline{R}_L(s) \;\geq\; \frac{L}{s^2 \cdot \log_2 e}\,(1+o(1)), \quad s \to \infty,\ L = 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{126}$$

The substitution $y = 1 - \ln 2/s$ to (120) yields the asymptotic formula (44) for the optimal relative weight $Q_L(s)$ of codewords in the ensemble of constant weight codes for which the asymptotic behavior of the rate described by the right-hand side (126) is attained.

To complete the proof of Statement 2, we need to check the sign of the equality in (126). We do not give here this verification for the reason of its awkwardness and also taking into account the small significance of its result. Statement 2 is proved.

**Proof of Statement 3.** For fixed integers $s \geq 2$, $L \geq 1$ and parameter $c > 0$, consider the following equation:

$$\left(\frac{y-y^s}{1-y^s}\right)^L = c(1-y), \quad 0 < y < 1. \tag{127}$$

The left-hand (right-hand) side of (127) is an increasing (decreasing) function of $y$, $0 < y < 1$. Hence, in the interval $y \in (0,1)$, equation (127) has a unique solution (root) which will be denoted by the symbol $y_L(s,c)$. Substitute this root to (120) and introduce the corresponding variables $Q = Q_L(s,c)$ and $r = r_L(s,c)$. For a fixed integer $s \geq 2$ and fixed parameter $c > 0$, the considered variables $y_L(s,c)$, $Q = Q_L(s,c)$ and $r = r_L(s,c)$ will be interpreted as sequences of integer argument $L$, $L = 1, 2, \ldots$.

Let an integer $s \geq 2$ and a parameter $c > 0$ be fixed and $L \to \infty$. The following asymptotic properties of the introduced sequences are evident:

$$\begin{aligned} &y = y_L(s,c) = 1 + o(1), \\ &r_L(s,c) = 1 - (s+c)(1-y) + o(1-y), \\ &Q_L(s,c) = \frac{1}{s+c}(1+o(1)), \quad L \to \infty, \quad s = 2, 3, ..., \quad c > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

Definitions (120)-(122) imply that for any $c > 0$, the random coding bound

$$\underline{R}_L(s) \;\geq\; \frac{1}{s+L-1}\, T_L\left(y_L(s,c), s\right), \quad c > 0, \tag{129}$$

where the variable $T_L\left(y_L(s,c),s\right)$ is defined by (122) with $y \triangleq y_L(s,c)$ and $Q \triangleq Q_L(s,c)$. Using equation (127) and properties (128), one can obtain the asymptotic behavior of the right-hand side (122) in the form:

$$\frac{T_L\left(y_L(s,c),s\right)}{L} = \left( \log_2 \left[\frac{s+c}{s}\right] - \frac{s+c-1}{s+c} \log_2 \left[\frac{s+c-1}{s-1}\right] - \frac{c}{s+c} \log_2 \left[\frac{s-1}{s}\right] \right)(1+o(1)), \quad L \to \infty. \quad (130)$$

It is not difficult to check that the maximum in the right-hand side of (130) is attained at $c = c(s) \triangleq \frac{s^s-(s-1)^s}{(s-1)^{s-1}}$. A substitution $c = c(s)$ to (130) with regard to (129) leads to the following asymptotic property for the random coding bound (120)-(122):

$$\underline{R}_\infty(s) \triangleq \lim_{L\to\infty} \underline{R}_L(s) \geq \log_2 \left[\frac{(s-1)^{s-1}}{s^s} + 1\right], \quad s = 2,3,\ldots. \quad (131)$$

After substitution $c = c(s)$ to the third formula of (128), we get the asymptotic formula (45) for the optimal relative weight $Q_L(s)$ for which the asymptotic behavior of the rate described by the right-hand side of (131), is attained.

To complete the proof of Statement 3, we need to check the sign of the equality in (131). We do not give here this verification for the same reason that was above observed for Statement 2.

Statement 3 is proved. Theorem 7 is proved. $\square$

## References


[1] *Mitchell C.J*, *Piper F.C.* Key storage in Secure Networks // Discrete Applied Mathematics. 1988. V. 21. P. 215-228.

[2] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Rykov V.V.* A Survey of Superimposed Code Theory // Problems of Control and Inform. Theory. 1983. V. 12. n 4. P. 229-242.

[3] *Kautz W.H.*, *Singleton R.C.* Nonrandom Binary Superimposed Codes// IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory. 1964. V. 10. n 4. P. 363-377.

[4] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Macula A.J.*, *Rykov V.V.* New Constructions of Superimposed Codes // IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory. 2000. V. 46. n 1. P. 284-290.

[5] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Macula A.J.*, *Rykov V.V.* New Applications and Results of Superimposed Code Theory Arising from the Potentialities of Molecular Biology // In the book "Numbers, Information and Complexity". P. 265-282, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.

[6] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Rykov V.V.*, *Rashad A.M.* Superimposed Distance Codes // Problems of Control and Inform. Theory. 1989. V. 18. n 4. P. 237-250.

[7] *Fano R.* Transmission of Information. A Statistical Theory of Communications. Wiley, New York - London, 1961.

[8] *Csiszar I.*, *Korner J.* Information Theory. Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1981.

[9] *D'yachkov A.G.* Bounds to Average Error Probability for the Fixed-Composition-Code Ensemble// Problems of Information Transmission. 1980. V. 16 n. 4. P. 255-259

[10] *D'yachkov A.G.* Random Constant-Composition Codes for Multiple Access Channels // Problems of Control and Inform. Theory. 1984. V.13. n 6. P. 357-369.

[11] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Rashad A.M.* Universal Decoding for Random Design of Screening Experiments // Microelectronics and Reliability. 1989. V. 29. n 6. P. 965-971.

[12] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Rykov V.V.* Bounds on the Length of Disjunctive Codes // Problems of Information Transmission. 1982. V. 18. n 3. P. 166-171.

[13] *D'yachkov A.*, *Vilenkin P.*, *Macula A.*, *Torney D.* Families of Finite Sets in Which No Intersection of $\ell$ Sets Is Covered by the Union of $s$ Others // J. Combin. Theory. Ser. A. 2002. V. 99. P. 195-218.

[14] *Stinson D.R.*, *Wei R.*, *Zhu L.* Some New Bounds for Cover-Free Families // J. Combin. Theory. Ser. A. 2000. V. 90. P. 224-234.

[15] *Lebedev V.S.* Some Tables for (w,r)-Superimposed Codes // Proc. Eighth Int. Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory. Tsarskoe Selo, Russia. September 8-14, 2002. P. 185-189.

[16] *Lebedev V.S.* Asymptotic Upper Bound for the Rate of (w,r) Cover-Free Codes // Problems of Information Transmission. 2003. V. 39. n 4. P. 317-323.

[17] *Engel K.* Interval Packing and Covering in the Boolean Lattice // Combinatorics Prob. and Computing. 1996. V. 5. P. 373-384.

[18] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Vilenkin P.A.*, *Yekhanin S.M.* Upper Bounds on the Rate of Superimposed $(s, \ell)$-Codes Based on Engel's Inequality // Proc. Eighth Int. Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory. Tsarskoe Selo, Russia. September 8-14, 2002. P. 95-99.

[19] *Nguyen Quang A.*, *Zeisel T.* Bounds on Constant Weight Binary Superimposed Codes // Problems of Control and Inform. Theory. 1988. V. 17. n 4. P. 223-230.

[20] *Vilenkin P.A.* On Constructions of List-Decoding Superimposed Codes // Proc. Sixth Int. Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory. Pskov, Russia. September 6-12, 1998. P. 228-231.

[21] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Vilenkin P.A.*, *Macula A.J.*, *Torney D.C.*, *Yekhanin S.M.* New Results in the Theory of Superimposed Codes // Proc. Seventh Int. Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory. Bansko, Bulgaria. 2000. P. 126-136.

[22] *D'yachkov A.G.*, *Vilenkin P.A.*, *Macula A.J.*, *Torney D.C.* Two Models of Non-Adaptive Group Testing for Designing Screening Experiments // Advances in Model Oriented Design and Analysis: Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Model Oriented Design and Analysis. Puchberg/Schneeberg, Austria. June 25-29, 2001. P. 63-75. Physica-Verlag Heidelberg, 2001.

[23] *Rashad A.M.* Random Coding Bounds on the Rate for List-Decoding Superimposed Codes // Problems of Control and Inform. Theory. 1990. V.19. n 2. P. 141-149.

[24] *D'yachkov A.G.* Lectures on Designing Screening Experiments // Lecture Note Series 10, Feb. 2003, Combinatorial and Computational Mathematics Center, Pohang University of Science and Technology (POSTECH), Korea Republic, (monograph, P. 112).

[25] *Cheng Y.X.*, *Du D.Z.* New Constructions of One- and Two-Stage Pooling Designs // Journal of Computational Biology. 2008. V. 15. n 2. P. 195-205.

[26] *Copperersmith D.*, *Shearer J.* New Bounds for Union-free Families of Sets // The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics. 1998. V.5. n 1. R39.

[27] *Galeev E.M.*, *Tikhomirov V.M.* Optimization: theory, examples, problems. Editorial URSS, Moscow, 2000. (in Russian)